

THE

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY

FEB 11 1961

LONDON QUARTERLY
& HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

JANUARY 1961

Contributors Include

RACE

MICHAEL BANTON, B.SC. (ECON.), PH.D.

G. ERNEST LONG, M.A.

DONALD G. MACRAE, M.A.

SHEILA PATTERSON, M.A.

D. F. ROBERTS, M.A., D.PHIL.

J. E. M. BAIKIE, B.D., M.LITT.

DONALD J. BOYS, B.D., PH.D.

RODERIC DUNKERLEY, B.A., B.D., PH.D.

REGINALD KISSACK, M.A., B.D.

HARRY PARKIN, B.D., M.TH.

W. S. PENN, B.SC.

WILLIAM D. ROBINSON, M.TH.

FREDERIC VANSON

JOHN T. WILKINSON, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.

HAROLD E. WINTER, B.D.



THE EPWORTH PRESS

[FRANK H. CUMBERS]

25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings and Sixpence Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	1	Personality in the Life of the Church by William D. Robinson, M.TH.	41
Race: A Biological View by D. F. Roberts, M.A., D.PHIL.	7	Norman Nicholson—A Contemporary Christian Poet by Frederic Vanson	44
Sociology, Psychology and Culture in Race Relations by Donald G. Macrae, M.A.	12	The Body Snatchers by W. S. Penn, B.SC.	48
The Sources of Racial Hostility by Michael Banton, B.SC.(ECON.), PH.D.	17	Unrealized Eschatology by Roderic Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	51
The Christian Church and Racial Divisions by G. Ernest Long, M.A.	23	Recreation in the Old Testament by Harold E. Winter, B.D.	55
The Way Forward by Sheila Patterson, M.A.	27	Wesley's Concept of His Own Ecclesi- astical Position by Reginald Kissack, M.A., B.D.	57
The Creed and Hymns of the Samari- tan Liturgy by Donald J. Boys, B.D., PH.D.	32	The New Heresy by J. E. M. Baikie, B.D., M.LITT.	61
John Newton and the Ministry by Harry Parkin, B.D., M.TH.	38	Recent Literature Edited by John T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.	66

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

To provide a Home for neglected and homeless girls and boys was the great ideal in the heart and mind of Dr. Stephenson when he founded the Children's Home in 1869. It remains the chief objective of its policy, for though social conditions have improved, there are still children who are deprived of a real home-life, with all that means in sorrow and tragedy.

So long as the need continues the National Children's Home will do its utmost to help these little people.
PLEASE HELP US TO CARRY ON



Chief Offices: Highbury Park, London, N.5

I

an
So
W
the
co
an

fo
W

Ch
wh
an
Ev
the
bu
list
in
flo
gu
lan

har
ma
it
We
acc

at
of
To
dea
(Re
Ad
sin

Editorial Comments

CHRISTIANITY AND RACE

IN THIS PRESENT generation racial hatred and discrimination have mounted alarmingly, and they seem now to be found in one form or another all over the earth. We see the consistent oppression of negroes in South Africa, the formation in our own country of a society to 'Keep Britain White', the resistance to liberal policies towards negroes in the United States, the scorn of Indians in the countries of Latin America, a very real 'colour complex' in India (see the Unesco *Courier* of October 1960), and centres of anti-Semitic propaganda in all the five continents.

What has Christianity to say on this subject? A very great deal. There are four matters of doctrine and ethics which have a particular bearing upon it. We will deal with them one by one.

MANKIND IS ONE FAMILY

Biology considers that mankind is one species, one family, and so does the Christian faith. The myths of the Old Testament embody this belief in a way which is quite unmistakable. In the beginning God created one man, Adam, and out of his side He took one woman. 'And the man called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living' (Gen 3₂₀). The story of mankind then continues until the time of the flood. Then there was a new beginning, but again it was from one man, this time Noah; and after a long genealogical list we read: 'These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations: and of these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood' (Gen 10₃₂). So much were they one family that they all spoke one language (Gen 11₆), and not until the affair of Babel were they given different languages and scattered over the face of all the earth.

It is true that at various times the Jews held other doctrines which can hardly be reconciled with this. They thought of Jehovah as one god among many, as a deity who had nothing to do with any nation except Israel. But it was the other idea which prevailed and was passed on into Christianity. We may now prefer to state it in other ways, but there is no question that we accept it.

It is seen as clearly in the New Testament as in the Old. Paul, in his speech at Athens, says that God made the world and all things therein, and 'made of one every nation of men for to dwell on the face of the earth' (Acts 17₂₆). To the Romans he writes that 'through one man, sin entered into the world, and death through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned' (Rom 5₁₂). What he means by that, as the context shows, is that because Adam was the forefather of the race, all men are somehow implicated in his sin. When he writes to the Corinthians, he contrasts two states—that of being

'in Adam' and that of being 'in Christ' (1 Cor 15₂₂). To be 'in Christ' is to be part of that living community of which Christ is the head and to share its life; to be 'in Adam' is to be part of that community of which Adam is the head, to be in fact one with fallen humanity, and to share its subjection to death. It is quite clear that mankind is thought of as one family.

GOD'S LOVE IS UNIVERSAL

God having made men of one family, it is the whole family which He loves and not merely some selected part or parts of it. Jesus was sent from Heaven, not because God 'so loved' the Jews, or the Aryans, or the Anglo-Saxons, or the whites, or the cultured, or the good, or whatever section of humanity we like to think that we belong to, but because He loved the world, the whole of it; and the purpose of His coming was that 'whosoever' believed in Him should be saved.

We need not be surprised that the men of the Old Testament did not always understand that God's love was universal. In their primitive times they had a primitive religion. Jehovah was the God of their tribe and cared nothing for the tribes of others. Others had gods of their own; let them look after their people if they could. What is significant is that the Jews, in their times of insight, saw very clearly indeed that God's care was universal. that He watched over all He had made, and that His purpose was to make His salvation known to the whole of mankind.

They looked forward to that day when the Lord would say 'Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hand, and Israel mine inheritance' (Is 19₂₅). They foresaw the Temple becoming 'an house of prayer for all peoples' (Is 56₇). They realized that it was too light a thing that God's servant should raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel, but that he was given 'for a light to the Gentiles' and that he might be God's salvation 'unto the end of the earth' (Is 49₆. Cf. 42₆). They portrayed the prophet Jonah as being sent by God to the people of Nineveh, who represented the heathen world at its worst, in order that they might repent and He might have pity on them.

In the New Testament this belief in God's care for the whole world is given clarity and full certainty; no longer is any alternative idea even considered. God is the 'Father of all' (Eph 4₆). Therefore 'the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame. For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him: for, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (Rom 10₁₁₋₁₃). Thus the promise is not merely to the Jews and their children, but 'to all that are afar off' (Acts 2₃₉). It is the purpose of God to gather into one all things in Christ (Eph 1₁₀), and the redeemed community in Heaven is to consist of people 'out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues' (Rev 7₉. Cf. 5₉).

It was in conformity with this belief that Jesus sent His followers to 'make disciples of all the nations' (Mt 28₁₉). Peter on the day of Pentecost preached to Jews 'from every nation under heaven', and with John (who had once wanted to call down fire from heaven upon a Samaritan village) paid a special visit to the

villages of Samaria to baptize their inhabitants, and later preached to a Roman, explaining that 'God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him' (Acts 10₃₄₋₆). Philip made a convert of an Ethiopian (Acts 8₂₇), and Paul preached to the Gentiles 'to make all men see' the dispensation of God's mystery (Eph 3₉).

IN THE CHURCH MEN OF ALL RACES ARE ONE

In this great purpose of God there is one nation which has had a special place, namely, that of the Jews, for His will was to make Himself known to the world and to fulfil His purpose in it through them.

Abraham was called with the promise that he should become a great and mighty nation, and that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen 4, 12₃, 18₁₈, 22₁₈), and the same promise was repeated to Isaac (Gen 26₄) and to Jacob (Gen 28₁₄). As the corporate son of God their descendants were called out of Egypt; they were covenanted with at Sinai; and during their long history they were again and again made conscious that God had chosen them. They, either as a whole or through a representative part or person, were God's servant who was to take light to the Gentiles; they as a nation were the prophet Jonah who was sent to preach to the heathen.

It is true that they often failed to understand their calling, that they tended to think they were chosen for special favour instead of for special service. It is true that, especially after the return from Exile, they thought much about their pure blood and about keeping themselves separate from the contamination of the outside world (though even then their scriptures reminded them that they were not such a pure race as they liked to think, and that King David's great-grandmother was a Moabite). But even as late as the beginning of New Testament times there was still some hope that they could be awakened to a proper sense of their responsibility, and at such an awakening Jesus aimed; He set out to do His work for the world through the Jews. So He tried to gather the lost sheep of the house of Israel. True He would minister to Gentiles whenever He came into contact with them, but the people He sought out, those from whom He called the Twelve, those to whom He sent His disciples on their mission tours, those whom He passionately longed to gather like nestlings under a mother bird's wing, those who so much upset Him by being like a fig tree that bore no fruit, those who broke His heart by refusing to recognize the heir of the vineyard, were the Jews. If He had succeeded in awakening them, He would have stirred them up at last to fulfil their ancient task; but they failed Him.

Since as a nation the Jews did not rise to their opportunity, as a nation they had their great task taken away from them. The purposes of God could wait no longer. The climax of His revelation had come, the supreme deed of salvation had been accomplished, and the work of spreading it throughout the earth must go forward whether they were ready to undertake it or not. Since the Jewish nation would not accept the task it had to be given to others. The nucleus of the Christian Church did indeed consist of Jews, but it was a small one, and it was not long before Jews were vastly outnumbered by Gentiles. No longer were the people of God one nation; the corporate instrument through

which God was to do His great work of saving mankind was now a Church of many nations. Even if the Jews had responded to Jesus, however, the day when the people of God were one nation was over. As we have said, the Jews were called in order that they might bring men of other nations into God's Kingdom; it is of the essence of God's Church that it is for all.

Within that Church race is no longer significant. So men found as soon as it began. The people who entered it were a mixed and various crowd, but they discovered that in Christ there was no distinction of Greek or Jew, barbarian or Scythian, freeman or slave. They worshipped together in their services, ate together in their love feasts, received together God's blessings, contributed together for each other's needs. They knew that they were all limbs in the same body; it did not occur to them to ask whether that body was black or white, and they solemnly rejected the idea that it was Jewish or Gentile. They had some differences of custom; those who were Jews, for example, retained some of the observances they had been used to. But they set themselves both against the idea of imposing the observances of one race upon another, and against the idea that differences in custom should be allowed to make a division in fellowship. God had made no racial distinction between them in the sort of salvation He offered or the terms on which it was given, and they were not going to make distinctions among themselves. All were one in Christ Jesus.

THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF LIFE IS THE WAY OF LOVE

God, who is the Father of all, is a God of love, and it is His purpose that in this respect His children should be like Him; as He loves them, so they are to love each other; as His love is universal, so theirs is to be universal.

When Jesus was asked how men were to live, He said that first they were to love God and second they were to love their neighbour as themselves. When the questioner asked, 'Who is my neighbour?' He replied with his parable of one man helping another who was in need. One of the interesting and significant things about the parable, however, is that the two men belonged to different races, and they were races which disliked and despised each other. Jesus indeed was not wholly content with this saying that we were to love our neighbours; on another occasion He added to it that we were to love them even when they were our enemies. There is a point here also that is significant for our present purpose. The saying about loving one's neighbour, which He finds too narrow, is taken from the Old Testament (Lev 19₁₈), and 'neighbour' is in that passage defined as 'the children of thy people'. We should expect, therefore, that Jesus's contrasted word 'enemy' would mean 'those who are *not* the children of thy people', that is to say, foreigners. This expectation is strengthened when we remember that the most obvious enemies which the Jews had in Palestine in the days of our Lord, and the ones which every Jew had constantly in mind, were the Romans; it is further strengthened when we notice that Jesus has just been talking about the Roman custom of conscripting Jews to carry baggage. It would be going too far to say that in this saying Jesus spoke solely of the relations between Jews and Romans, but it would be doing His words less than justice to fail to recognize that, although He intended

them to apply to other relationships as well, He certainly intended them to apply to that of race.

It is not sufficient, however, to say that we must love men of all races without saying what we mean by love. There are those who claim that we can love negroes and yet keep them segregated; it is better for them that way. There are those who believe we can love Jews but refrain from having anything to do with them; they do not have the same principles of business morality as we do. There are apparently those who believe that we can love Russians and blast them off the face of the earth with nuclear rockets—or perhaps they think that Russians are a special case to which this command of Jesus does not apply.

Christian love cannot be defined or exemplified in a couple of paragraphs. All we can do is to state the main truths about it which are relevant for our present purpose. Fortunately that is not too difficult. Let it be said first that love is an attitude of the whole personality. It is not merely an emotion; it is a set of the will and issues in action; it may continue in great strength, and indeed it often does, when for one reason or another emotion is numb. Nevertheless, it is not mere good will and good works either; to go about coldly doing men good is to make a monstrous and offensive parody of it, even if it includes bestowing all one's goods to feed the poor or giving one's body to be burned; there must be at the heart of it a genuine care. It is a giving of one's whole self.

Its quality and meaning are seen in the words and works of Jesus, who is not only our Saviour but our Pattern. When we look at and listen to Him, we see that it means dealing with men as individual persons; we remember how He sought contacts with all and sundry, and made every one of them personal; we remember how He encouraged this man and rebuked that one, how He called this one to be a disciple and sent that one home, how He healed this one with a word and that one with spittle and clay, dealing with each separately according to his capacity and need. We see that it includes a sense of men's infinite value; we remember how He spoke of the lost sheep and the prodigal son and the enormity of causing one of these little ones to stumble, how He made Himself men's servant, how He tried to win them rather than compel them, and how at the last He laid down His life for them. It includes compassion, so often spoken about in the gospels, and meaning a putting of one's self by imagination in men's place and feeling with them. It includes doing unto others as one would that they should do unto one's self—that is, doing those good things which compassion reveals to be needed and desired by the deepest part of their selves. It means a real sharing of men's lives (the very principle of the Incarnation); we remember how He ate and drank with them, whether they were honest fishermen or minor quislings or hypocritical Pharisees, how He conversed and made friends with them, whether they were madmen living in tombs or Samaritan adulteresses drawing water from a well or rulers who paid visits by night, how He joined with them in their synagogue worship even when they were seeking excuses to plot against Him, how He took part in their feasts even when they were determined to make an end of Him. It includes, in the end, the laying down of life itself, not only for one's friends but for one's enemies. We see, moreover, that this love has nothing to do with men's deserts; none of the people to whom Jesus ministered had any claim

upon Him as far as we know; many of them were certainly morally, socially and religiously undesirable; but like the Samaritan and the Shepherd and the Father in His own best-known parables, He was concerned not at all with desert, but only with need.

THE APPLICATION OF THIS TEACHING

Since God has made all nations as one family, since He loves all men without distinction of race, since in the Church all races are one, and since the Christian way of life is the way of love, certain things ought to follow, at any rate for Christians, who believe these things. Some of them concern our relationship with men of other races inside the Church; others concern our relationship with men of other races outside it.

Within the Church divisions of race signify nothing. That is not to say that they may not sometimes correspond with other differences which have to be taken account of. The most obvious of these is difference of language; whether it corresponds with a difference of race or not, it obviously makes it necessary for some Christians to worship in one service and some in another. Similarly, differences in temperament and culture may mean that certain methods of worship suit some people and other methods suit others; here again these differences often correspond with differences of race. But we must keep clear in our minds that it is differences of language, temperament and culture that we are taking account of, not race, and that in many cases these divisions do not correspond with racial ones; so we shall expect to find in our churches a mingling of races, even though in any given church one race may predominate. Moreover, we must not allow these differences of language, temperament and culture to divide us in the wrong way. The divisions we make on their account are for convenience only; they are not fundamental cleavages. We are still one Church, one body with one heart and one soul, all the various parts being limbs working together for the good of the whole and for the growth of the body to completion.

Men of other races who are outside the Church must be treated as those who belong to the same human family as ourselves, those who are loved by the Father of us all to the same infinite extent that we are, those who, if His purpose is accomplished, are destined one day to be united with us in the still closer bond that exists in the family of Christians. What this means has been made very clear to us. We must seek their welfare in ways which spring out of a genuine care for them. We must deal with them as persons, seeking relationships with them that are on a deeper level than the formal ones of such things as labour; we must treat them as individuals, not merely as members of a racial group; we must recognize their infinite value, put ourselves by imagination in their place, do for them those good things which the deepest part of them desires, and in some real sense share their lives. (To separate Himself from any man would have been the last thing Jesus would have thought of; it would have defeated His whole purpose.) Moreover, we must do all this to the point of sacrifice. Only in this way can we be true to the Lord who has called us to His service, and who Himself has done all these things for us.

RACE: A BIOLOGICAL VIEW

D. F. Roberts

THE RISE OF the science of genetics in the twentieth century has brought about a radical revaluation of the concept of race. Before 1900 the mechanism of biological heredity—the bridge between generations by which the biological characters of parents are transmitted to their children—was not known. The physical means by which this transmission occurred was thought of as the passage of some mysterious substance, often referred to as 'blood', to the offspring in whom it mixed and blended so that the contribution of each parent lost its own individuality in the child. This seemed to be supported by observation; children of parents differing in skin colour, for instance, are often of intermediate pigmentation. Thus according to this blending theory, each person was a 50/50 mixture of the characters of each parent; he derived a quarter of his make-up from each grandparent, and progressively smaller fractions from more distant forebears. Hence the descendants of parents showing hereditary differences would come to resemble each other more and more, and pure races in which all individuals were alike would be expected to emerge, even though hybridization between two unlike stocks were their initial source. Such blending, in other words, ought to suppress variation.

The blending theory was based on a fallacious assumption—that the 'hereditary substance' could be divided and mixed *ad infinitum*. The work of the monk Mendel, published in an obscure journal in 1865, but not appreciated until 1900, showed that what is transmitted from parent to offspring consists of discrete elemental factors, later to become known as genes and to be identified as situated at particular points along the chromosomes of the sex cells somewhat in the manner of beads on a string. A very large number control the biological make-up of a human individual. Genes are remarkably stable units; they do not blend or lose their individuality no matter in what combinations they occur. Hence once hereditary variability has arisen it should persist indefinitely, provided that the normal pattern of reproduction is by mating of individuals who are not very closely related. Every human group, be it race or tribe or family, consists of individuals differing from each other in the hereditary characters which they have received from their parents and which they will transmit to their offspring; save in the case of identical twins, no two individuals have the same set of genes, and consequently there can be no 'pure races'. These differences are of course relative. The more ancestors that are common to all members of the group, the more similar they are likely to be genetically; members of a single family therefore look more alike than members of a single race, who again are more similar than all members of a single species. All mankind belongs to a single species, all are alike in the majority of their essential physical characters, members of all races are able to inter-marry; that is to say that many many similar genes are held in common by all mankind, and only relatively small numbers of genes are responsible

for the minor hereditary differences between members of different races or between individuals of the same race.

If genes are so stable, how then do hereditary differences originate? Genes represent specific potentialities which allow the developing organism to respond in particular ways to the environment; the end-result of the various genes controlling an individual's stature will be different according to whether he grows up in an environment where there is an inadequacy or sufficiency of food of the right kinds. In the 'pre-genetics' period it was thought that what was inherited changed its character according to the environment, that there was inheritance of acquired characters, a view which is no longer held. What indeed happens is that, very rarely, a gene which has been stable for many generations may suddenly and spontaneously reproduce itself in a new form and continue to reproduce in that new form thereafter. A gene at a particular locus on a chromosome which for generations has given rise to the development of normal haemoglobin in the red blood cells may suddenly change into one which causes an abnormal haemoglobin to be produced. Such spontaneous changes are known as mutations, and they are almost always deleterious. The gene-complex is an extremely intricate balanced entity, which may be likened to the mechanism of a watch; a sudden random physico-chemical change in the nature of a single gene is almost certain to lead to disturbance of the balance, just as if mischievous fingers were to replace one of the cogs of the watch by another picked at random out of a drawer. Mutations do not occur as adaptive responses to the environment, of which they are almost entirely independent; they can however be induced by exposure to X-rays and other ionizing radiation—hence the danger from atomic bomb explosions. Very, very rarely, however, a mutation may occur the effect of which is to make the individual as well, or slightly better, fitted to his environment. The new randomly produced gene then is not eliminated from the population, and, with the passage of numerous generations, there may come to be by the same process at each locus on the chromosome several different forms (alleles) of the gene available, of which each individual carries two; it is such mutant genes that are the original source of all hereditary variation. These alleles are maintained at optional equilibrium frequencies in the population by the balance of the advantages they give in any particular environment.

A race is essentially a biological division of mankind. It has been suggested that the term 'race' should itself be removed from everyday parlance on account of the misuse to which it is commonly subject; nine times out of ten it is used to refer to a grouping of mankind that is not biological but, e.g., political or social. But biologically it remains a useful word, to denote some degree of relationship, and therefore some degree of bodily resemblance, at a level less inclusive than the species, though, having established that any idea of race uniformity or purity is nonsensical, it is clear that to identify a race by listing a number of characters which all its members and only its members possess is impossible. A species is made up of individuals sufficiently similar in the genes they possess to enable them normally to produce viable offspring, but so different genetically from individuals of other species as to prevent any extra-specific mating being fertile. Many many thousands of the genes that every member of the species *Homo sapiens* possesses are similar to those of every other human being; these are the genes that produce humanness. Many of them come to

us from our animal ancestors, but to a proportion, and especially the combinations in which they occur, our species owes its uniqueness. All of them have been derived from the gene pool of our earliest human common ancestors, from whom every man living is distantly descended, and we have retained our inheritance because our forebears at first did not, and subsequently were not able to, exchange genes through crossing with any other species. Distinction of categories below the species level is less clear. Mankind, spread over almost all the earth's land-surface, lives in relatively small communities, and mating goes on usually either within the community or between neighbouring ones. Genes therefore are interchanged less frequently the farther apart the communities, or where they are separated by some geographical or social barrier. There occurs partial biological separation or indeed isolation of groups; changes in gene frequency are therefore not transmitted from the group of communities in which they originate, so that eventually local populations come to be characterized by different gene frequencies, the differences being greater the farther apart the populations; and indeed some genes may be entirely absent from some populations, but present at 100 per cent. frequency in others. One can therefore apply the term 'race' at several levels of inclusiveness. A group of local essentially intra-breeding populations (often culturally identifiable—for example, in the case of many tribes or tribal segments) which are identical in their gene frequencies may be said to form a local race; this is the more restricted usage. Or a continental grouping of populations—for example, all the Negro peoples of Africa south of the Sahara—may be regarded as a race, since, although they differ from one another in the frequencies of a number of genes (e.g. those controlling the ABO blood groups), in others (e.g. the gene combinations associated with the Rh blood group system) the frequencies are quite similar but differ from those characteristic of other continental groups of man; this usage may be equated with the 'grandes races' of French anthropologists, and perhaps also the zoological category of subspecies. Whatever the level of inclusiveness used, it is clear that race differences consist essentially of differences in the frequencies of particular inherited features. Thus fair hair (not associated with albinism) is common in Scandinavian and Baltic populations, occurs sporadically in some Australian aboriginal peoples, is absent in central African negroes; the epicanthic or Mongolian eyefold, which gives the eye its slanting appearance, is common in eastern Asian populations, occurs at appreciable frequencies in some African groups, but only in an occasional individual in European peoples. The features, differences in whose frequency distinguish race from race, are in essence those by which individual differs from individual within the race. It is possible to save the life of a particular European by a blood transfusion from an African of the appropriate blood group, but to kill him by a transfusion from his European next-door neighbour whose blood is of an incompatible group.

A race then is not a static entity. New hereditary characters arise, though rarely, and those that are already in existence slowly change their frequencies; so that the race itself is changeable. The idea of a permanently superior or inferior race is therefore fallacious. Race is a dynamic category, representing a stage in the evolution of the population, a stage in the process by which it becomes better fitted to its environment. Natural selection, the process of

increasing adaptation to environment, is complex. The raw material of evolution is provided by mutations, which by themselves alone would have relatively slight effects on gene frequency. Through selection, however, which means that those possessing favourable characteristics have a better survival rate and leave more offspring, the frequency of a favourable mutant in the population is increased. It seems, for instance, that the high frequencies of the gene responsible for the abnormal haemoglobin S in many African populations are attributable to a slightly increased resistance to malaria in individuals possessing one gene for haemoglobin S and one gene for normal adult haemoglobin over those that have two genes for normal haemoglobin. There are two other processes, however, entering into race formation, which are less dependent on environment. The first, random variation in gene frequency, or genetic drift, from generation to generation, is unlikely to have played any significant part in differentiation of recent populations save in the very smallest of isolated local groups, though it may have been of importance in the early days of human evolution when most populations must have existed in such a state. Much more important, particularly in the last few centuries of large-scale population movements, is the other process, hybridization, which seems to have occurred to some extent wherever groups have come together. The emergence of new races by this process can be seen in many parts of the world, e.g. in South America and the West Indies; the American negro in the U.S.A. is already differentiated from the African negro—about one-third of the gene pool of the former is derived from non-African sources. And, of course, on the new genes introduced by the immigrant population, and the new genetic combinations in the hybrid, natural selection continues to operate.

There is no reason to suppose that the combinations of characters by which individuals of different races are ordinarily distinguished by the man in the street have not come about through these processes—natural selection acting on the genetics of partly isolated populations, the results being shuffled about from time to time by intermixture. It is true that of the selective significance of many features, generally taken as racial criteria, little is as yet established. This is due partly to the recency of the present approach and partly to the fact that the characters themselves do not easily lend themselves to elementary genetic analysis; it is much easier to work with characters such as the blood groups governed by single genes than with, say, skin colour, where a number of genes are involved. Nonetheless, in the last few years there has been a tendency for the adaptive significance of biological characters to receive more and more attention, even though the genetics of many is not fully analyzed. The tendencies to more linear physique in tropical, and to more squat physique in arctic peoples seem to be adaptations facilitating the maintenance of the body heat balance in the different climates. Variations in the shape of the nose facilitate the humidification of inspired air. The facial engineering of northern Mongoloid peoples, with the flatness of bone structure and protective padding of fat, it has been argued, may be advantageous in conditions of extreme cold; the epicanthic fold may serve doubly to protect the eye against freezing in the arctic and against glare. Increased skin pigmentation has occurred in several genetically distinguishable tropical groups of man—in Africa, South-East Asia, Melanesia and Australia, tropical America (this last by comparison with

Amerindians in other parts of the continent, and to a lesser degree than in other parts of the world)—so that it seems of considerable advantage in conditions of intense solar radiation, probably serving as a screen to protect the deeper tissues from harmful ultraviolet rays. The little information that is available for physiological measures indicates that where differences exist they also make for greater efficiency in the native environment. Thus in high temperatures, tropical peoples are more economical in their sweating than acclimatized Europeans; in cold, blood flow in the hand in Eskimo is greater than in Europeans, so that the former are better able to perform work with their hands in severe conditions.

Fuller understanding of the nature of race differences is now possible. The combinations of characters that are present at different frequencies in different races have arisen because they have proved to be advantageous in the past in the conditions in which the race was evolving. Race differences therefore represent different superiorities in different respects. To pick out any one race as being intrinsically biologically superior is nonsensical.

SOCIOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE IN RACE RELATIONS

Donald G. MacRae

THE IDEA THAT all men are basically similar, victims of a common destiny, slaves to similar duties, possessed of equal rights, and bound by the same compassion, is comparatively modern. W. W. Tarn, a great recent historian of the Hellenistic world dates this concept to the world empire of Alexander the Great. Certainly the Stoics accepted it in a form that yet isolated each man from each in an armour of invincible philosophy. The idea took a new form with Christianity—though Christians have often enough denied it in theory, more often in action—and for 2,000 years the concept of the brotherhood of man has agitated the world. It is not yet, as we all know, universally and finally victorious: perhaps victory of this kind is impossible in our dispensation.

The fact that human beings are biologically various—not even identical twins quite justify the word 'identical'—and that this variety can extend to a vast number of obvious physical characteristics such as pigmentation, shape of skull, nose, eye or genitalia, the nature and distribution of hair, the proportions of body and limbs, and so on, does not explain hatred, aversion or contempt. Biology may provide obvious differentia; it is society which seizes on this differentia to justify feelings and acts expressive of solidarity or repudiation. If we wish to understand the problem of race we must ultimately approach it from the points of view of sociology and social psychology. People are unwilling to accept this, and they strive to justify their reactions in terms of biology through all sorts of monstrous *non sequiturs*. Above all they try to show that there is a direct relation between biological differences and psychological constitution—particularly between intelligence, of personality and biological 'race'.

Now it seems to me that the modest judgement of the greatest of American anthropologists, A. L. Kroeber, is almost certainly correct. It is very hard to believe that there is systematic physical variation, i.e. 'race' and no systematic psychological variation. Such statistical variation if it exists could provide no ground for racial intolerance or discrimination, for it could have no moral import. It could affect no individual, for the heart of statistics is that for it individuals do not exist, and that therefore no conclusion can be drawn about any specific individual. More extraordinary, as I am going to suggest, is it that all attempts to show the existence of such variations are doubtful at best—and usually patently unsuccessful. Yet, as I shall also suggest, there are systematic variations to be discovered, but it can be shown that these are artefacts, the creation of social experience and social relations, not of biological necessity.

Take, for example, intelligence. Since the introduction of the modern intelligence test by Binet in 1905 there have been certainly hundreds—and perhaps thousands—of attempts to show that the distribution of intelligence

varies with races. American Indians and people of Negro African origins in the United States and the West Indies have been the main groups investigated, but probably no society of any size—certainly no so-called racial group—has gone unstudied. The problem is to get a test which will not be loaded against one set of people and in favour of another. This might not seem difficult, but consider the problems involved if we begin with, for example, language.

Most tests are what is called 'verbal'. If they are administered in a language understood by the victims is this not sufficient? The answer is negative. Bilingual children score lower than their monoglot contemporaries in Wales, Belgium and French Canada. In later life, however, they appear to catch up, and bilingualism is often in life a real advantage, a 'superiority'. Again the connotations of words differ with local experience, and a test that demands the association of one word with another will fail to do justice to local variation and penalize all those who have different connotational values from those of the psychologists who devised the tests.

In many cultures competition and/or display by the young is forbidden as ill-mannered. This is particularly true of verbal display. But testing assumes motivations which are competitive and overtly invidious, and this factor may invalidate comparative test scores. And in some societies all problem solving is co-operative, not individual. Where this occurs the private activity of being tested is unrealistic to a degree as a measure of innate differences of capacity.

Non-verbal tests have been devised, but these are open to similar objections. The matrices which most conscript to our forces encountered are non-verbal, but they assume a common logic, concern with pattern and with two-dimensional representation which is not by any means universal or equally distributed between societies. It is possible, in fact, to offer severe criticisms of any tests of intelligence—however useful they may be for limited purposes of social or educational selection—as instruments for the measurement of inter-racial differences of intelligence where the races also belong to different cultures.

But what about the situation where races share the same culture and social experience? American Negroes might appear to be in this situation. We find that on average they do less well than whites in America, but if we break down the picture things change. Northern Negroes score better than Southern whites; urban Negroes score better than rural Negroes; Negro intelligence varies with latitude, increasing as one goes north; in Los Angeles Negroes are above the American national white intelligence average; Negroes in segregated schools have low scores, while those in desegregated schools score comparatively with their white school-mates—and so on. There are two plausible explanations of all this: either there is selective migration of abler stocks from country to town, from the South to the North, etc., or there are cultural differences of environment at work on a more or less uniform stock which produce these varying test results. (It is also possible that some combined explanation is correct.)

My own view is that no conclusion is possible in our present state of knowledge. Many people tend in fact to adopt some theory of selective migration, but I am doubtful about this. After all, one can argue either that migrants are

intelligent, vital and questing folk, or—equally plausible!—that they are the failures, the rejected and ineffectual who move because they 'cannot make the grade'. There is no evidence either way. I suggest that the curious reader forms his own conclusion from such sources as Chapters 20-2, A. Anastasi and J. P. Foley, *Differential Psychology*, O. Klineberg, 'Race and Psychology' in the U.N.E.S.C.O. volume, *The Race Question in Modern Science*, and P. E. Vernon, 'Race and Intelligence' in *Man, Race and Darwin*, edited by P. Mason.

In the last-named, and most recent, of these, Professor Vernon, following the Canadian psychologist, Nebb, distinguishes Intelligence A—'basic capacity of the nervous system'—from Intelligence B—'the end-product, the efficiency of the mind as developed . . .'. He concludes that 'we do not know whether there are differences in Intelligence A, and are unlikely to be able to find out . . .'. Our real concern is with Intelligence B—'the level of development . . . which a particular culture favours. If we are talking of white middle-class Intelligence B, then the differences revealed by American or British tests are perfectly genuine. . .'. This conclusion seems to me useful and sensible. Of itself it can provide no objective referent for behaviour which takes as its premise racial inferiority or superiority. We cannot treat groups, far less individuals, as intrinsically inferior on such a basis, though we may legitimately continue to use tests for, say, educational and vocational selection.

Intelligence has been widely studied, but there is less to be said about character and temperament. In the 'thirties it was usual to attack such concepts as 'national character' as meaningless, but common experience renders this merely silly. There *are* uniformities of group behaviour and outlook between societies and also within them. There is no evidence that these have a biological basis. As with intelligence, we are confronted on the biological question with a Scots verdict of 'Not proven'. What is certain is that character and temperament are learned and culturally conditioned, and that they embody historic attitudes and experiences which the child has unconsciously imbibed and the adult has preserved. Very often, of course, these attitudes have no connexion with present circumstances and problems.

One factor in this which I believe often neglected is the double legacy of slavery. With few exceptions all West Indian and American Negroes are the descendants of slaves. It is nearly a century since Lincoln emancipated the Southern slaves, and though emancipation occurred earlier in the British West Indies, yet the status of the Negro there was in many respects a servile one for more than a generation after manumission. This has naturally, if regrettably, left a legacy of both contempt and guilt in white attitudes towards Negroes, not merely in the areas concerned, but also in the North and to some degree in Britain.

On the other hand slavery has had certain consequences for the descendants of former slaves. Inevitably there is a sense of grievance towards all whites. In addition, slavery involved the slave in a world of values where labour and industry were imposed virtues, thrift was impossible, foresight inevitably illusory, and ambition dangerous or even criminal. The domestic virtues were hardly open to the slave. Violence was not over-common—slaves were valuable property, and one does not readily injure an expensive possession—but brutal

violence was the ultimate sanction in the slaves' experience. Most of the values of a high culture were, naturally, quite unknown or even unimaginable to the slave. Religion was confused with magic or was distorted into an ideology of weak subservience to intolerable wrong.

It is astonishing, therefore, not that some of the stereotypes of the lazy, shiftless, promiscuous, superstitious, sly and violent Negro should be partly true, but that they are so largely false. There is no innate reason for them; they are the result of a particular kind of socialization process, of attitudes learned almost unconsciously—certainly not deliberately taught—in the home. They are of steadily diminishing relevance to reality and of steadily diminishing importance. There is, however, enough of them left for the stereotypes, held by many white people to justify their discriminatory behaviour, to have some objective referent—though, of course, no moral justification.

The whole situation is made worse by the common lot of the immigrant. Immigrant and unskilled labour always gets a raw deal in any society. It is not valued highly—even when it is needed for hard and disagreeable work. Lost and strange, it tends to congregate together. Poor and unfamiliar with the ways of a new society, it tends to run down property and to be exploited in its housing—often by *entrepreneurs* from its own background. It cannot understand the values of an established, alien order, and its most ordinary behaviour in terms of its culture of origin may offend just by being alien. Moreover, it is always felt to be a threat by the unskilled and poor of the host society, who, even in a time of full employment, expect little in the way of economic security and who expect to be undercut by the newcomers.

When in addition there is a language barrier—as with Poles or Italians in Britain—or a religious one—as (still) with the Irish—the situation is made worse and more obvious. An immediately visible difference, like a heavily pigmented skin, allows fear, prejudice, and the catharsis of petty persecution or even major violence to become most easily manifest. It is remarkable that, indeed, there is so little of this. There has been no post-1945 race riot in Britain to compare with the shameful outbreak of 1919 in Liverpool, and there is a new atmosphere of tolerance in our society and disapproval of racial feeling and action, and a new conviction that people should be educated out of their prejudices.

Another new factor is the existence of the independent African states. Anyone who has stayed in Africa will soon realize that, just as in Europe there are great differences, culturally generated, between Europeans, so there are between the different African peoples. Indeed these may be very great in a single country; the profound variations of culture and character in Britain between English, Scots, Irish and Welsh, are more than matched by the differences between the various peoples of, for example, Nigeria. But what these states have in common is an absence—the absence of the *damnosa hereditas* of slavery. I don't mean by this that there were not slaves and servile groups in many (not all) traditional African societies, but this was very different from the uniformly servile status of the uprooted Negro in the New World. The very existence of these states means that the Negro in America or Britain feels a new confidence, pride and identity. In much of this he may be mistaken: highly educated American Negroes are more interested in the new African

states than the members of these states are interested in the problems of coloured people in the West. It does not matter; the new states, successful or not, give a new feeling of an equal place in the world, a new feeling that all collective endeavour is not vain, and a lifting of the psychological burdens imposed so long ago by institutionalized slavery.

Alas, this does not necessarily mean an end to invidious feelings and acts expressed through racist ideology. There is a growth sometimes politically fostered, of anti-white feeling in some of the new states and among some coloured people in the West. The Englishman at home, the 'John Bull', can be regarded with contempt just as he is learning to lose his colour prejudice and behave better!

Nor does a national state inevitably produce security. The position of the Jews has undoubtedly improved in most countries over the last fifteen years or so, but it is hard to believe that the existence of the state of Israel has had much to do with this. Rather is it the consequence of an all but universal shame and guilt at the things done by the Nazis and their pack of European collaborators and lackeys.

The history of the external relations of Diaspora Jews to the societies in which they found themselves, but of which they only became full members in recent times, is full of instruction. In an agrarian world the Jews were urban and mysterious strangers burdened by a stigma less religious than superstitious. At the same time their religion and ritual did separate them from their neighbours. And this religion did involve a certain alienation from the classical and syncretist aspect of Christianity, and also from the moral emphases and discoveries that are so central to most forms of Christian teaching. I have tried elsewhere—in Chapter 7 of *Man, Race and Darwin* (ed. P. Mason)—to make use of the sociological concept of the 'stranger' as developed by G. Simmel, to explain certain aspects of racial ideology and prejudice, given that cultural and other differences do most certainly exist in society. It is this type of analysis which I am sure most explains the ill-treatment of the Jews.

In the modern, urban, diversified world of easy physical movement from country to country, of highly diversified occupational rôles, it is becoming more possible and easier (as well as more necessary) for people to accept varieties of cultural difference and not ascribe to these any racial basis of inferiority or superiority. We are all becoming 'strangers' to each other, and therefore are all the more in need of each other's tolerance and goodwill. What is more, despite Notting Hill in 1958, events in South Africa, and the slow pace of progress, I think there is progress in this direction, and that tolerance is increasing in most countries while the ideology of race steadily declines. Obviously I don't know if, say, the traditional Chinese contempt for foreigners has decreased or merely changed form under Communism, but that over most of the world improvement is taking place is certain. All rational arguments of fact and advantage are in favour of tolerance, but men, of course, often act against reason and against even their material profit.

One last point: tolerance is not an abrogation of the duty of rational moral judgement. Just as it is wrong to condemn individuals or groups for variations from one's own biological pattern, it is also wrong to say that no comparative judgements of cultural worth are possible.¹ Not only are they possible, they

are necessary if anything is to be done to improve social life. It is not only superior technology that can be exported or imported; so also can superior customs, institutions and values. Without racial pride the peoples of mankind have each much to learn and something to teach.

¹ See M. Ginsberg, *On the Diversity of Morals*, London, 1956—in particular Chapter 7.

THE SOURCES OF RACIAL HOSTILITY

Michael Banton

THE SYSTEMATIC STUDY of racial hostility is a development of the last sixty years. Before the present century there was the occasional writer—an Ibn Khaldun or a Montesquieu—who could see that there was a problem here, but there was no tradition of objective examination. That, as so much else, began with Darwin.

But Darwin's influence upon social science cut both ways. The demonstration that the progress of humanity was subject to biological laws led many people to believe that all questions concerning social life had to be explained in biological terms and that no other explanations were required. One school of writers, strongly imbued with this approach, elaborated the theory that racial hostility served an evolutionary function. Each race represented a possible line of human evolution and competed with other races for survival. If the process of selection was to continue the races had to be conscious of their separateness, so racial hostility was thought to be the complement of patriotism; aversion from strangers joined with love of one's own kind as a means of developing to the full each people's peculiar potentialities.

With the rebuttal of this theory and the demonstration of the limitations of the biological approach to such matters, the contribution of the social sciences begins. The biological thesis implied that hostility towards other groups was an *inherited* trait, and hence it should be readily observable in children. Close study has overwhelmingly documented the contrary proposition; children show hostility towards other groups only where they have learned it from their parents or from other members of the society in which they have grown up. We are dealing, therefore, with a form of *learned* behaviour. This makes us ask: how is it transmitted and what ends are served by it that such a pattern

should be perpetuated? The second of these questions is the more important for our present discussion.

Racial friction presents many aspects and can be seen in very different forms. On closer study, it proves to be an arbitrarily defined division of the much larger field of human conflict. Aversion from people whose culture does not blend with that of our own group is a factor operating not only between peoples of different race, but also within single nations. (Does it not inhibit relations between people of different social classes in our own country?) Then there are striking similarities between the attitudes and conduct of those who persecute Jews and those who crusade against Communists, Negroes, homosexuals, or other scapegoat minorities. (Do not those who attack Jews tend to attack the others also?) Again, when two races mingle, but one of them rules the other, opposition between them is basically political, though it tends to take on a racial hue and to attract to it a cluster of emotional factors. As political and economic influences are invariably involved in situations of racial conflict, it is difficult to isolate any specifically racial element; race relations have to be seen as a form of human relations in which people's group affiliation is revealed by their physical appearance, but could be symbolized in many other ways.

It is most instructive to consider the varied ways in which, since the beginning of the century, writers have discussed racial prejudice. In the earlier years racial prejudice was identified with the belief in the inherited superiority of one's own race. Marxist writing took over this concern with prejudice as the expression of a doctrine, and held that by stigmatizing a group of people as inferior or inhuman, racial prejudice helped the capitalist to exploit them or their resources. Later came the Freudians, who saw prejudice as an irrational tendency in the individual personality, and they in their turn have been criticized for not giving proper weight to the way group contacts are moulded by custom and circumstances. Nowadays it is usual to distinguish between the doctrine, the function of the doctrine, the disposition of the individual, and the behaviour of the individual. The belief that a man's behaviour is determined by stable inherited characters deriving from separate racial stocks, some of which are superior to others, is known as *racism* or *racialism* (an American usage is to employ the former term for the doctrine and the latter for its practice). Similarly, *prejudice* is distinguished from *discrimination*; the former is used to denote any emotional and rigidly hostile disposition towards members of a particular group, the latter to denote the differential treatment of persons regarded as belonging to particular social categories. Prejudiced people do not discriminate in all situations and discrimination is not always actuated by prejudice. Nor is discrimination necessarily evil. People can discriminate in favour of a minority as well as against one, and before we can decide whether or not we think them justified we need to know all the circumstances of the case.

Only by sorting out the components of racial hostility in some such way as this can it be adequately analysed. But to obtain a proper perspective on it we also need to take a further step backwards in time and consider the circumstances in which people, without showing outright hostility, keep other races at a distance. It is not easy to say at what point hostility begins, so it is advisable to take account of those situations in which people of the subordinate race may

think themselves victims of hostility even though they are unjustified in interpreting matters so narrowly.

RACE AS A SYMBOL OF SOCIAL STATUS

Let us consider the case of an African colony like Uganda, where there are three principal groups: Europeans, Indians and Africans. In recent years the European group has been principally distinguished by its higher standard of living based on a higher average income and appreciably better levels of education, together with a greater influence upon the determination of governmental policy. A few of the Indians have been rich and well educated, but the majority have constituted an intermediary group midway between Europeans and Africans in income and skill. Each group has had its characteristic style of life, related to its family organization, religion, language, ties with homeland, etc. Thus a stranger in the streets of Kampala could make a good guess about the sort of people he met on the basis of their physical appearance; occasionally he might make a bad mistake, but this would not happen very often. It has been shown that in such circumstances as these, race serves as a symbol of a person's status in society; it indicates how to approach and what to expect from him.

The European views such a system as one designed to harness European leadership to help Africans to attain higher living standards and a greater measure of political autonomy. The Indian sees it as designed to preserve European interests and to assist the Africans at the expense of the Indians, who have done most to develop commerce and raise living standards. The African sees the system as one which authorizes strangers to appropriate African land, to utilize his resources and labour power without his being able to find out whether or not he is being paid what they are worth, and to bring in foreigners to monopolize the best jobs. Each group sees the others in terms of its own position, and develops rationalizations in defence of its own interests (of the kind: 'Orientals can live on a handful of rice a day', though rarely as naïve as this). Contact between the races occurs chiefly at work and in commerce, relatively rarely in leisure hours; each has its own sports and pastimes, so that only infrequently are they brought together in pursuit of a common aim. Experience teaches that to bring groups together in order that they shall mix is futile; friendship between groups grows most easily when they work together towards a common objective. Colonial rule cannot help but divide a multi-racial society, for it obliges each group to jockey for position with the others and to consider its own interests. This opposition induces racial groups to minimize internal differences in order to present a united front to others, and makes it harder to develop loyalties to nation, Church or profession which effectively cross the colour line. Independence does not solve this problem automatically and it often only reveals divisions within the racial groups. To build a nation in such circumstances requires the stimulation of patriotism internally, and the dramatization of common interests in opposition to an external enemy—like the Goldstein of 1984 or Snowball of *Animal Farm*.

Where, as in the colonial case, race serves as a symbol of membership in distinctive groups, two lines of development are possible. Left alone, the

tendency is for the lines of demarcation to become blurred. From the beginning, some Africans adopt European ways, and they may well be encouraged to do so, since there is a pressing demand for interpreters, clerks, policemen, catechists, etc., if European skill is to be most effectively deployed. Some Europeans take native concubines, and an intermediate group grows up. There is an increasing number of people who belong to a socio-economic category other than the one which, earlier, would have been designated by their race. Friction tends to centre upon these new classes—African *élites* or poor whites—whose presence challenges the equation of race with status. In colonial territories in which the whites are not permanent settlers, imperial policy has allowed this tendency to gather momentum and it has resulted in the transference of political power. In territories with a powerful minority of white settlers, this group has used its influence to try to prevent any overlap between groups which would confuse the lines of social demarcation. In the course of everyday life whites are continually dealing with Africans as subordinates, so the association between colour and social status comes to possess an emotional significance; this is all the stronger because such groups are conscious of being minorities and feel that they must be continually prepared to resist any move that might threaten their position.

The emotional significance of skin colour can become remarkably intense—as witness the attempts of some settler countries to attract immigrants from any European country, no matter what their technical skill or educational level, provided only they are white and the existing colour line can be maintained. Another important factor is that once patterns of racial stratification become established they create vested economic interests in their maintenance. A minor example of this has been provided by the principal British shipping line to West Africa. At least until a few years ago, it refused to accept bookings from Europeans for third class passages on its liners, stating that it considered this accommodation 'unsuitable for Europeans'; Africans could travel either first or third. The company thus played on racial sentiment to preserve its market for first class passages at an artificially high level.

THE SPRINGS OF RESENTMENT

We can see why, in certain situations, members of one group will mistrust and dislike the members of another, but why does this, in some individuals, become transformed into so virulent an animosity? Why should a natural tendency to keep strangers at a distance be changed into a hatred out of all proportion to any danger that they may present?

It is in seeking an answer to this question that the Freudian theory proved most successful. Every human, if he is to live in society, must refrain from behaviour likely to disrupt the life of society. As a small child he is taught that he may not try to gratify certain of his desires but must accept the regulations of his group—to which he is gradually introduced in the course of growing up. These repressions and restrictions build up considerable hostility in the individual towards the people who frustrate him, but he does not dare to attack his own group, because he has identified himself with them. Consequently there is always an accumulation of aggression which will be dis-

charged when a permitted target appears. A useful distinction has been drawn here between direct aggression, in which rational hostility is aroused by social or economic conflict, and displaced aggression, which occurs when a stranger group is made a scapegoat for other peoples' discontents. Displaced aggression is irrational in that it may be vented on people who have done nothing to deserve it. This theory helped explain why racial hostility is so often of an unreasoning character; it also offered an explanation of why competition between groups is supplemented by personal hostility.

Further research showed that people with certain personality characteristics were more likely than others to display prejudice; for example, people with authoritarian leanings were found particularly prone to see social problems in racial terms, while others who suffered from emotional inadequacies sought to allay their own inner anxieties by blaming scapegoats, like the Jews. The strangers towards whom prejudice was directed were seen not as they really were, but in terms of stereotyped ideas about '*the Jew*', '*the Negro*' and so on. Fifty years ago an American research worker gave some classes of schoolchildren the following silent reading test:

Aladdin was the son of a poor tailor. He lived in Peking, the capital city of China. He was always lazy and like to play better than to work. What kind of boy was he: Indian, Negro, Chinese, French or Dutch?

To his bewilderment, very many children said he must be a Negro! From his, and others' observations, grew a series of enquiries into the formation and function of such stereotypes. It is now known that they play an essential part in the thinking of extremely prejudiced people who twist any contrary experiences so as to reinforce their preconceptions. When dealing with such people, psychiatrists say, the question to ask is not 'How did they come to be prejudiced?' but 'Why do they need to be?' Prejudice is, then, the symptom of a disease, not the disease itself.

It would be dangerous to take the rabid anti-Semite as he is known in Europe to be a type case by which to judge the ordinary European's attitude towards Jews or coloured people, but the tendency to make scapegoats out of an easily-identified minority is an important one. African aggression against Indians in Eastern and Southern Africa often appears to display an additional violence because it allows Africans to work off on a more vulnerable group the resentment they feel towards Europeans. Most societies have their scapegoats, and as young people grow to maturity they learn that these are the permitted targets on which they can vent their spleen.

WHEN IN ROME, DO AS THE ROMANS

The Freudian approach succeeded almost too well—especially in America. It was comforting to assume that prejudice was fundamentally an individual disorder, for this rendered it unnecessary to examine the organization of society to see if it produced situations of group conflict in which hostility was an intelligible response. In recent years concern with prejudice as one of the sources of racial hostility has declined. Attention has shifted to the causes of discrimination. One interesting enquiry in America demonstrated that the

same group of workers who would not allow Negroes to move into their neighbourhood accepted them readily in the factory in which they all worked. The authors of the study underlined the influence, on the one hand, of the neighbourhood club which advocated the residential segregation in the locality, and, on the other hand, of the trade union which had a firm policy of non-segregation. People took their cues from the organization which decided what the convention was to be, and they were not worried by contradictions in their conduct.

To explain that a certain kind of discriminatory behaviour is customary, and to show how the custom has become established, is not, however, a satisfactory explanation of why it goes on being practised. Why this custom rather than another? Economic interest is, of course, frequently a relevant factor, but it is by no means all-important. Let us consider two other influences of which every European has personal experience. Firstly, the more members of a group mix with one another and develop their own conventions, the more will they resist the entry of a stranger who does not know those conventions. The inhabitants of an isolated village regard even someone from a neighbouring county as a foreigner. Within a highly integrated group like this, people understand one another more easily and have much greater control over one another's deviations. So we may expect people to have least objection to mixing with strangers in situations governed by clear-cut rules of conduct—like being fellow-passengers on the bus—and most objection in situations guided by implicit ideas of the proper way to behave—such as becoming fellow-members of the family by marriage. Secondly, in a class society like our own, people are frequently influenced by consideration of how their social standing may be affected by particular courses of action. What appears to be a colour bar may turn out to be a class bar. People may not wish to be seen associating with members of a stranger group because it might be interpreted to their disadvantage—what would the neighbours think?

Inter-group tension poses many questions and requires as many answers. Psychologists have shown that prejudice meets a need of the personality; all of us have resort to scapegoating in some degree. Sociologists have shown that discrimination is an inevitable consequence of group formation; the barriers that prevent unacceptable people from being admitted cannot be abolished without dissolving the groups themselves. Conflict is an inescapable characteristic of human society, but with determined leadership, it can be turned into channels more constructive than racial hostility.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND RACIAL DIVISIONS

G. Ernest Long

THROUGH ITS origin within Judaism, the Christian Church, at the beginning of its history, met the racial issue in perhaps its toughest form. For Judaism there were two kinds of man, the Jew and the Gentile: and this division was one of the chief pre-occupations of the early Church. The stories in Acts about Peter's vision of the clean and unclean foods, the baptism of the household of Cornelius, and the Council of Jerusalem, the argument of the Epistle to the Galatians, the reiteration of the same theme in Ephesians—these all show how vital the racial issue became as Christianity broke out of the shell of Judaism to become an interracial society. Ever since that time the Church as a whole has held by the statement of St Paul: 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.'

But practice has not always agreed with theory. In the early Church the Christian fellowship does seem to have surmounted successfully the barriers of race. Justin Martyr says: 'We, who hated and destroyed one another, and on account of their different manners would not live with men of another race, now, since the coming of Christ, live familiarly with them.' This statement appears to be a correct description of the facts. But we should remember that already the Roman Empire was steadily eroding racial divisions, until Caracalla in A.D. 212 extended Roman citizenship to all free-born subjects of the Empire. Although the Christian Church had gone further than this, and had extended its citizenship to both bond and free, yet in such a setting racialism was not likely to present a very intractable problem.

Also, even in the early period racial differences may have played some part in the various Church schisms. It was no doubt because Ulfilas, the apostle of the Goths, happened himself to be an Arian that the Goths, and after them the Vandals and the Lombards, adopted Christianity in its Arian form. But the survival of Arianism among the barbarians long after its virtual disappearance among the citizens of the Empire suggests that the difference of race helped to prolong the schism. One reason for the stubbornness of the Donatist controversy may have been that Donatism spread in North Africa among the Berbers and that the Catholics were of Roman or non-native stock. Similarly, the Nestorian and Monophysite schisms, though they originated in doctrinal differences, yet tended to harden along national and linguistic boundaries. The split between the Eastern and Western Churches, also, had its non-theological root in the divergence between the two races; and even at the time of the Reformation it was, roughly speaking, the Teutonic races that became Protestant, the Latin that remained Roman Catholic. In none of these instances was race the ostensible cause of division; the battle was fought out on matters of doctrine. But it would appear that in the deepest and most

lasting schisms the racial factor tends to reinforce a genuine theological disagreement.

On the other hand, where Christians have shown what looks like genuine racial feeling, and that of a bitter and disgraceful kind, this can on occasions be traced to religious, not racial, intolerance. One example is the treatment of the Jews. Judaism as a whole rejected the gospel, and the Jews were the earliest persecutors of the Church. From this stems the long record of hostility between Jew and Christian. After the conversion of Constantine, the Christian emperors, with the general approval of the Church, passed the same restrictive measures against Jews as against pagans. But it was only in the Middle Ages that severe persecution began. Then the ghetto system was started. Jews were compelled to wear a distinctive badge, and there were violent outbreaks against them as prejudice was inflamed by the crusading spirit and by disasters, such as the Black Death. But here we should distinguish between popular feeling, which was inspired by racial hatred as much as religious bigotry, and the official policy of the Church, which could not countenance racialism. When the Church authorities persecuted the Jews, as in the Spanish Inquisition (though we should recognize that even this was under royal and not papal control), the professed aim was the conversion of the Jew, not his destruction: and if he received baptism he was accepted into the Christian fellowship, except when the Inquisitors, justifiably mistrustful of their own methods, suspected him of insincerity. So far as the declared mind of the Church was concerned, the offence of the Jew was his religion, not his race.

We have to turn to modern history, the period of European expansion, for some of the most signal examples of racial prejudice among Christian nations. Here, too, however, we need to distinguish between the acts and attitudes of those 'who profess and call themselves Christians' and the official policy of the Christian Churches. When Columbus made his famous voyage, one of his aims was the conversion of the inhabitants of the New World; but the adventurers who followed him, intent chiefly on their own interests, began a merciless exploitation and oppression of the native peoples, and promoted the Negro slave traffic, which, tolerated for so long, remains a blot upon the Christian conscience in spite of the great part which Christian influence eventually played in its abolition. Wherever the first impact of the Europeans upon coloured peoples was primarily for motives of trade and conquest, the result has almost always been a sickening record of bloodshed and brutality.

But over against this we must set the heroic counter-efforts of Christian missionaries, backed by the convictions of the Christian Church. At the beginning of the Spanish occupation of South America, the Dominican, Bartolomeo de Las Casas, spent his whole ministry fighting against the ill-treatment of the Indians, and it was probably owing to his advocacy that the 'Laws of the Indies' were passed for their protection. Another Spaniard, Pedro Claver, worked on behalf of Negro slaves, and, against the opposition of slave-owners, insisted that they should be accepted into the Church on equality with the whites. In the Portuguese dominions the Jesuit, Vieira, denounced the brutal treatment of Indians and Negroes, and procured a protective edict from the Portuguese crown. For this the settlers had him deported, but they were not able altogether to nullify his work. These are a few of the more

eminent names in a long line of Roman Catholic missionaries who fought constantly against racial oppression, and not without success.

The story of the colonization by Protestant powers is much the same. The West Indies will serve as one example. After they came under British control, their population consisted almost entirely of Negro slaves owned by a white minority. Scarcely anything was done either for the spiritual or general welfare of the slaves until the Moravians, the Methodists and the Baptists began missionary work among them. This was at first bitterly opposed by most of the slave-owners. Acts were passed in colonial Houses of Assembly which, had they not been vetoed by the British Government, would have virtually brought the missions to an end. Some missionaries were imprisoned; Negroes who attended religious gatherings were flogged; and as the campaign for emancipation drew to its climax in England, violent feeling was aroused among the white settlers against the Churches which had championed the cause of the blacks. Yet it was largely owing to the efforts of these Churches that emancipation was carried out so peacefully and successfully, and that there has been no general colour bar in the West Indies.

Where, in the colonizing process, the missionary motive has been dominant, and the Churches have been able to exert a strong influence, there racial feeling has been kept in check, and the welfare of the inhabitants has been regarded as a chief concern. In the Philippines, for instance, the Spanish occupation was inspired as much by religious zeal as by the desire for trade; and, though the conquest was carried out by force, Philip II instructed his troops to behave like Christians, to show goodwill towards the inhabitants, and not to engage in the slave trade. Missionaries were sent out with the support and patronage of the crown, and as a result, this country was the first in Asia in which the majority of the people accepted Christianity, and their material condition also seems to have been to some extent improved. Similarly, in New Zealand the first white settlers were Protestant missionaries, who devoted themselves to the conversion and welfare of the Maori, and steadily resisted proposals for European colonization because of the evils it was likely to bring. They failed to prevent this in the end; but when the British annexation took place, their influence helped to secure for the Maori the Treaty of Waitangi, which gave them rights of citizenship and guaranteed them in the possession of their lands. Though the provisions of this treaty were not fully observed, yet the comparative prosperity of the Maori and the almost complete absence of a colour bar in New Zealand can be attributed very considerably to the efforts of the Christian Churches. This is in marked contrast with the position in Australia. There missions had a much more subordinate share in the early history of the colony, and so failed to protect the aborigines from much oppression and suffering, and, in the case of the Tasmanians, from extinction.

Only in South Africa and the Southern states of the U.S.A. have great Churches, over a sustained period, recognized and tried to justify a colour bar. This attitude would appear to spring from particular historical circumstances which these two regions have in common. The Southern states, after their defeat in the Civil War, were compelled to emancipate their slaves; and the measures in the various states which established a colour bar were the attempts of the defeated to safeguard their social status and defend what they

considered to be their way of life against both the emancipated Negroes and the pressure of the North. This policy both split existing Churches, and also resulted in segregated Churches and a denial of full Christian fellowship. In South Africa, the Dutch immigrants decided, in 1717, to prohibit further immigration from the mother country and to depend upon slave labour. Hence they remained a small white minority, menaced, as they felt, by strong and hostile black nations and, in process of time, by British immigration and British power. They too were compelled by the British Act of Emancipation to free their slaves; and for them too the colour bar is an attempt to protect their own status in a position where they feel themselves weak and threatened. But the significant difference between the U.S.A. and South Africa is that in the former the Constitution has been increasingly interpreted as ensuring the social and political equality of all citizens, white and black, whereas in the latter a Government which claims to be Christian is consistently pursuing a policy of deliberate segregation. This is condemned by all the great South African Churches except the Dutch Reformed; and even this Church has been constrained to deny any concept of inherent racial superiority.

The pattern that emerges from this study is fairly uniform. The Churches, in their official utterances and policies, have, with a fair measure of consistency, refused to recognize any barriers to Christian fellowship or any idea that one race is by nature superior to another. But the members of nominally Christian nations, particularly the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic, have often shown strong racial prejudice. This has led to a continual struggle between the white settler and the Christian missionary—a struggle in which the missionary has often been supported by the government of the mother country. The settler, on the other hand, has tended to claim that his standards and his livelihood depend upon the maintenance of white supremacy, and that he understands native people better than meddling missionaries or distant governments, though common sense suggests that segregation is bound to produce ignorance. It is important to recognize that this struggle has been going on in many parts of the world and almost incessantly, at least since the beginning of the period of European expansion, and that the battles which are being fought out in Africa and other continents today are just the latest skirmishes in one long debate—a debate in which, where the issue has been already decided, the settler has normally lost the argument. In the words of the Methodist Church of South Africa: 'Civilisation will not be corrupted by fellowship, understanding and charity. On the contrary, it may be corrupted and destroyed by division, fear, rivalry, and resentment.'

THE WAY FORWARD

Sheila Patterson

RACIALISM IS THE major problem of human relations that faces the world today. It is particularly a problem and a challenge to Christendom. For while racial and minority conflicts exist in Islam and elsewhere, the extremes of racist feeling and behaviour seem to have developed amongst professing Christians, particularly those from northern Europe, in their contacts with peoples of different and often simpler cultures on the expanding frontiers of the Western world.

Apart from sections of the Dutch Reformed Churches in South Africa, whose spokesmen claim Biblical authority for policies of racial separation, the Christian Churches of the world have in recent decades emphatically reaffirmed the supra-racial and universal nature of Christianity, a nature obscured by centuries of schism, national rivalries and economic and cultural cleavage. This supra-racial conception, this belief in the fundamental unity and essential equality before God of all mankind, was clearly stated by St Paul nineteen centuries ago in his speech on Mars hill: 'And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth' (Acts 17₂₆), and in his reference to the Christian Church as a community 'Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free but Christ is all and in all' (Col 3₁₁).

What this should mean for the practising Christian today has been laid down firmly and unequivocally by a series of Church councils and conferences. Typical was the statement by the Conference of the International Missionary Council at Tambaram, Madras, in 1938.

We would make the unit of co-operation the human race. We cannot stop within the unit of class or state or race or ecclesiasticism. . . . God has made all peoples of one blood. No race can therefore disregard the rights and interests of other races. Racial persecution is particularly abhorrent. The Church should exert its influence on the side of all movements working for the full and equal sharing by all races in the common life of mankind. In doing this the Church must purge its own life of any racial discrimination.¹

The great mass of professing Christians are, however, social animals caught up in a web of customs and relationships which they rarely measure against the ethic in which their way of life is rooted. Despite undoubted progress in the ecumenical movement itself, there is, as Dr Visser 't Hooft pointed out recently, 'still a serious gap between what the Churches know to be right and true and what they actually do in situations of conflict or social pressure'.²

The goal in race relations is, however, a clear one and one to which few even nominal Christians would on reflection refuse their assent. It is that the word 'race' should lose all but its biological connotation, and that 'racial' affiliation, real or alleged, should cease to be a criterion for the allocation of rights, privileges and responsibilities between groups or individuals. Here the

Christian and the humanistic traditions of the West are at one, although the former lays more stress on a God-centred unity, the latter on a man-centred equality.

How are we in the West, Christians, Jews and agnostics alike, to practise what we preach, and to achieve this goal in the dwindling time and area left us to exert any influence on world affairs?

This challenge is both an ethical and a practical one, but it is more in terms of the latter approach that I shall be trying to meet it here. As a citizen of a multi-racial Commonwealth and a student of race relations in Africa, the Caribbean and at home, I should like to put forward certain lines of action³ along which we in Britain could move towards the goal of racial concord both here and in an evolving Commonwealth.

First of all it should be stressed that the girding principle of such action is that it should conduce to the integration of groups and peoples on an equal basis in a harmonious social whole. Such integration need not, however, lead to assimilation, in the sense of 'making alike'. It need not involve the expunging of all social, cultural and physical differences, but simply the eradication of racial discrimination and exclusiveness. Unity and essential equality in diversity is our goal, and a far more inspiring and attractive one than a brave new world of regimented, mono-cultural, khaki-coloured units.

Britain is both the home of a homogeneous Western Christian people and the centre of a great multi-racial and multi-cultural Commonwealth. Until recently the bulk of the British population had little or no direct contact with the peoples of the Commonwealth, about whom, when they thought of them at all, they cherished a large number of patronizing, ill-informed and often derogatory notions. Now, when the whole equilibrium of the Commonwealth is changing, when the 'family' is ceasing to be one based on kinship and Anglo-Saxon culture and is becoming a wider 'familia' based on less tangible links, the people of this island face two tasks. Not only are they required to make an 'agonizing reappraisal' of their own attitudes and relationships to former dependents who are now equal, they are also called upon to reformulate and apply this new relationship here at home, in direct contact with a quarter of a million coloured Commonwealth immigrants in their midst.

Here it should be emphasized that the so-called 'colour problem' in Britain is not at present a colour problem at all as it is in the Southern states or in southern Africa. Basically it is an immigrant problem. The newcomers, even the English-speaking, Christian West Indians, come from a sufficiently different social, economic and cultural background for misunderstandings and frictions to arise between them and the local population in all kinds of situations. These frictions are aggravated by such factors as economic recessions, the housing shortage, and the mild xenophobia which is a cultural norm in Britain. They would arise just the same if the immigrants were white, as they did in the case of Jews, Poles, Italians and Southern Irish, although undoubtedly the high visibility of these particular immigrants tends to accentuate their social and cultural differences and to prolong the processes of integration.

■ The situation in Britain is, however, a 'colour problem' in the sense that the immigrants, who are often far more colour conscious than the local British, and the emerging Afro-Asian Commonwealth countries, tend to regard it as

such. They tend to judge Britain's good faith in international relations by her ability to put her own house in order. The situation in Britain is also potentially a colour problem in that the present fluidity and variety of attitudes and behaviour amongst the British could conceivably harden into a more rigid pattern of relationships between the local population and coloured minorities. In these circumstances the usual British *laissez-faire* approach to newcomers is clearly inadequate and some sort of social action on both a short-term and a long-term basis is clearly indicated. Three main types of social action seem indicated in the field of race relations in Britain. One aims at the reduction and elimination of discriminatory behaviour, a second at the reduction of racial antipathy and prejudice on both sides, and a third at promoting the adjustment integration or assimilation of immigrants.

The two latter are clearly long-term policies, involving educational and welfare action. The first type of action, that designed to reduce discrimination, can, however, be taken immediately and on a national level. It should, if supported by reiterated policy statements from the Churches, political parties, labour leaders, employers and others, also help to create a climate of opinion favourable to the carrying-out of long-term programmes. Whether or not we accept the thesis that the majority of Britons are colour-prejudiced, or that, as seems to emerge from most field-work studies, British attitudes towards coloured people are uncertain and flexible, and there is more discriminatory behaviour than colour prejudice in Britain, there seems to be an excellent case for anti-discriminatory legislation. It is sometimes argued that 'you cannot legislate against prejudice', that such legislation must be preceded by a change in attitudes and *mores*, and also that by singling out particular groups it is in itself discriminatory and may provoke further discrimination.

The answers to these objections are, firstly, that legislation is designed to reduce discriminatory behaviour, not prejudiced attitudes; secondly, that experience in the United States has shown that effective legislation can help to produce changes in *mores* in so far as public relationships are concerned; thirdly, that such legislation should not be limited to colour or racial discrimination, but should extend to discrimination against religious and other minority groups.

Anti-discriminatory legislation in Britain would have a limited scope, but it should be perfectly possible to reduce discrimination in public housing, hotels, restaurants, bars, places of public entertainment and even employment, although the latter field presents more practical difficulties. A few test-cases in the courts should help to establish a pattern of behaviour for publicans, landlords, employers and others, who at present are hesitant or swayed by 'what the regular clients (or customers or employees) will say'.

The existence of such legislation should also help to dispel the uncertainty and insecurity felt by many immigrants. They would know where they stand in all but the most intimate social relationships, and could gradually lose the prickly colour-consciousness that often stands in the way of easier contacts with local people.

Social action concerned with the reduction of racial antipathy and prejudices is, as I have said, a long-term matter. A start should be made now from a national level, but the ultimate application will come through smaller groups

and individuals, and the results may not be fully visible for a generation. The most important item in such action is a thorough revision of our educational system, which is largely responsible for the insular ignorance of most British adults today about the peoples of the Commonwealth and indeed the outside world as a whole. Such action would necessitate the revision of geography and history text-books, many of which still reflect outmoded notions of colonial superiority, and the biological inferiority of the coloured races. It would involve the wider teaching of Commonwealth and world history and the introduction of race relations courses in teacher-training colleges, since far too often one comes across teachers who are far more racially conscious than the young children they are teaching.

Even more fruitful than such teaching may be the extension of interchanges of pupils and also of teachers between Commonwealth schools, and the consequent opportunity for first-hand contacts between peoples and cultures.⁴

The campaign to educate tomorrow's generation to take their place in a multi-racial Commonwealth can, however, be largely vitiated if the children return each day to homes where the old climate of aversion prevails. The Churches, the trade unions and the mass media have probably the greatest chance of reaching into and influencing these homes. So far as radio and television are concerned, however, there is still in many programmes a tendency to reflect popular misconceptions on race rather than to dispel them, and some systematization, perhaps in the form of an agreed code of reference, might be found possible. The Press is not by its nature susceptible to centralized directives, but the ball might be set rolling if repeated cases of blatantly-prejudiced reporting of situations involving people of different races or creeds by a particular paper were to be brought before the Press Council.

The third type of social action is the most positive. It aims at promoting the individual adjustment and social adaptation of the immigrants, and is concerned with such matters as immigrant reception, advisory and welfare services, industrial relations, recreational facilities and community relations. This work falls largely on to the special West Indian Migrant Services Division in this country, and on to a wide range of British voluntary associations, both lay and religious. There is room for further development and for greater participation by local authorities, and also for spontaneous individual action, provided it is untainted with patronage or artificiality.

These then are the three lines of social action which should conduce to racial and group harmony here in Britain. In essentials they would seem to be applicable to the much greater and more complex problems that confront the evolving plural societies in the Commonwealth.

There are five main ways of resolving relationships between two groups of differing ethnic or cultural backgrounds. They are extermination, separation, domination, co-operation and amalgamation. In the plural societies of Africa the emphasis has hitherto been on domination, and only now have programmes of separate development or co-operation and integration been tentatively advanced, in each case with the object of allowing all individuals and groups to develop to the full their potential capacities. Due allowance may be made for the goodwill and good faith of many advocates of separate development, but its economic impracticability has already been adequately demonstrated.⁵

In the Central and East African territories under British rule or influence, the trend, however hesitant, is away from domination and towards co-operation and integration, though not necessarily amalgamation. There is no space here to discuss detailed programmes for the various territories. They must obviously differ in emphasis and in pace, taking into account such elements as the facts of power, the rights and interests of minorities, economic possibilities and cultural differences.⁶ All should, however, include progressive anti-discrimination legislation in areas of public association (work, schooling, political life, administration of justice) between groups, legal safeguards for minority rights, long-term programmes aiming at the reduction of racial antipathy amongst all groups, and action by government, the Churches and voluntary associations to promote co-operation between the various groups in the welfare and cultural fields, and to establish a common set of values in the society as a whole.

Britain still retains a certain power of decision in Central and East African affairs. So far as the Union of South Africa is concerned she gave up this power in 1909. The most positive way of influencing the South African situation would therefore seem to be by example. The successful emancipation of the all-African states of the West must be followed by the successful evolution of multi-racial or non-racial states in the Centre and East. Boycotts, blockades and anti-*apartheid* demonstrations in Britain are unlikely to upset the present South African rulers, but may well worsen the lot of those whom they are intended to help. This also applies to the demand for South Africa's expulsion from the Commonwealth. It should not be impossible to devise a formula, acceptable to all Commonwealth members, whereby South Africans of all colours should still feel themselves part of the Commonwealth, whatever the behaviour of the government in power.

So far I have been discussing social action within particular territories. If we are to move towards the goal of supra-racial unity we must, however, press for the rapid extension of economic, educational, welfare and other schemes in the Commonwealth as a whole. Much of the animus in the Commonwealth's 'colour problem' comes from the fact that the colour line falls in roughly the same place as the line between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots'. If the new Commonwealth is to have any meaning or duration, it is this dual problem that has to be tackled by the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' alike, not only in a spirit of expediency but with an eye constantly turned towards the goal of supra-racial brotherhood, of unity in diversity.

¹ W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *The Ecumenical Movement and the Racial Problem*, U.N.E.S.C.O., Paris, p.48. See also pp.46-50 for other similar statements.

² *ibid.* p.50.

³ These programmes are generally agreed upon by social scientists with experience of the race relations scene in Britain. See, for instance, Richmond, *Race*, Vol. I, No. 2, May 1960; Banton, 'White and Coloured', K. L. Little, 'Colour and Commonsense', *Fabian Tract* 315, 1958, price 2s. 6d.; Institute of Race Relations, *Coloured Immigrants in Britain*; Ruth Glass, 'Newcomers'.

⁴ See H. E. O. James and Cora Tenen, *The Teacher was Black*, 1953, for a particularly successful instance of personal contact between English children and Nigerian teachers.

⁵ For a recent restatement of the pros and cons of *apartheid*, see *South Africa*, by S. Pienaar and Anthony Sampson, published for the Institute of Race Relations by the Oxford University Press in April 1960.

⁶ For some proposals for the future of Central Africa see the following: Mason, *Year of Decision*; Leys and Pratt, *A New Deal in Central Africa*; Sanger, *Central African Emergency*; Creighton, *The Anatomy of Partnership*.

THE CREED AND HYMNS OF THE SAMARITAN LITURGY

Donald J. Boys

THE SAMARITAN LITURGY clearly reveals on almost every page the Samaritan Creed with its five main points: 'My faith is in Thee, O Yahweh, and in Moses, the son of Amram, Thy servant, and in the holy Law, and in Mount Gerizim, the House of God, and in the Day of Vengeance and Recompense.' It is interesting to notice, as Montgomery points out in his *The Samaritans*, that 'the first three points of the Creed are identical with the cardinal beliefs of Judaism, whilst the fourth is the cause of the schism'.

1. *Yahweh, the One God.* One does not have to look at many of the Hymns in the Liturgy before realizing that the Samaritans are as sure of the uniqueness of their God as the Jews themselves. God is one, and He is the sole Object of worship. For the Samaritans 'There is no god but one,' and they never tire of repeating the 'Hear, O Israel' (Dt 6₄). The praise of Yahweh's uniqueness, His being apart, His oneness, His spirituality (the Samaritans avoid anthropomorphic expressions even more carefully than the Jews) is repeated again and again throughout the Liturgy. The following quotations are typical:

God of gods . . . for ever the eternal One . . . one in His Godhead, the first, the living One. . . . He hath no likeness. . . . Doer of wonders! Creator! Righteous and eternal One! One in Godhead, alone in oneness, apart in greatness, first in beginning . . . He hath no shape, no form . . . there is no associate, and no second. . . . Yahweh is His name. . . . He changeth not. . . .

Their God is approachable, listening to and accepting all petitions, but He is also a jealous God, who can be angry with His people. The Samaritans put their whole trust in God, looking to Him for their sure salvation, both from their present enemies and from the Day of Vengeance, which is coming upon those enemies and upon the enemies of the Law.

2. *Moses, the Son of Amram and Jochebed.* For the Samaritans there has never been, nor will there ever be, anyone equal in prophetic dignity and apostolic power to Moses. Whilst it is perhaps too early to compare the Samaritan doctrine of 'Moses His servant' with the Christian doctrine of 'The Son of Man', it may be noted from the following references that Moses is far more than prophet *par excellence*. In the Liturgy there is more than a hint of his pre-existence. It is claimed that when God said, 'Let there be light', these words were used concerning Moses. He is always closely associated with brilliance and light; 'he is the light and the sun of prophetic power', and 'the light of creation and its sun'. He stands in a special relationship with God; there was not a third with them on the mount. It is by Moses that atonement is made, and he is mediator, through whom prayers are to be said and recompense received. The Samaritan prays, 'Be entreated by him [Moses]', and claims that 'Prayers and peace are through him'. It is difficult to decide whether or not Moses is thought of as the *Taheb* ('the Messiah'—'the one who will

come'), but there are indications that the Samaritans think of him as existing at the beginning of the creation, and that he is eternal—'the prophet who was existing at the secrets in the beginning, and will be existing at the day of vengeance . . .' The following are common references to Moses:

The choicest of the teachers . . . the star, the light . . . the prophet of the world . . . the light of the prophets . . . by the hand of him who made atonement . . . the select one. . . . Moses opened paradise and the way of the law. . . . Moses, the saviour. . . . My faithful one, My man . . . the anointed one . . . the star of stars . . . sent to redeem an exalted people.

There are other passages which show that Moses actually went into the 'high places of heaven' to receive the Law, and that there the angels served him, saying: 'Welcome! Servant Moses! O thou with whom there is no second! O thou who art the tree of life in the midst of the garden!'

3. *The Holy Law.* The respect and love which the Samaritans have for Moses the lawgiver is equalled by that which they have for the Law, which God gave through him. This perhaps cannot be shown so well by making direct quotations from the Liturgy as by pointing out the basic position of the Law in all the services. Whenever possible the scriptures are read, either by quotation, or in 'qataf' form.¹ Many important verses of scripture are used as refrains in the prayers. There is nothing like the Law for the Samaritan, and they have never put anything alongside the books of the Law as the Jews have done; they are apart and unequalled. They have consistently rejected all Jewish books except the Torah itself. There is protection in the keeping of the Law: 'May God protect thee by the keeping of the Law', and there is blessing: 'Blessed are they who keep them [the Ten Words].' Just so there is woe for those who do not keep the Law: 'Blessed are they who observe their ways, but woe unto those who forsake the ways of truth and what is written in the holy scriptures', and 'Everyone who opposeth our joy and doth not believe in the law will die'.

4. *Mount Gerizim, the House of God.* For the Samaritans there is no place on earth like Mount Gerizim. It was there that God revealed the Law to Moses His servant. It is to Mount Gerizim that the faithful look for their comfort, and to which they make their way whenever possible to keep the festivals. It will be upon Mount Gerizim that the habitation of God will be revealed. It is the everlasting hill and the holiest of all places. This tenet of their faith is one of the main causes of the schism between the Jews and the Samaritans. The vital importance of the hill is emphasized by the putting of the Samaritan 'tenth' commandment at the end of the Decalogue—it is upon mount Gerizim that the altar is to be built. The following quotations from the prayers show Samaritan feeling about their mountain:

The most lofty of all places . . . the everlasting hill . . . the house of God . . . the most select part of the dry land . . . the mount of inheritance and of the presence . . . May ye see the habitation upon the holiest of the mountains in the day of the Taheb!

5. *The Day of Vengeance and Recompense.* There are not many direct references to the Day in the Liturgy, but there is clearly given the impression that the blessings which are to come upon the Samaritans (because of their

faith in Yahweh, Moses, the Law and Mount Gerizim) will not by any means be shared by all. The time is surely coming when the enemies of the Samaritans and of the Law will be punished; this is the Day of Vengeance. Cowley (in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, X.669) has shown far more details of a Samaritan eschatology than can be worked out from the Liturgy. There he links the idea of the Day of Vengeance with the idea of the Taheb. He says that the Taheb is the restorer, or the one who shall come; that since the schism of Eli and the disappearance of the Tabernacle, the world has been suffering under the divine displeasure; that this will be terminated by the coming of the Taheb, who will restore the period of favour, and live on earth for 110 years, and then die; that the resurrection will take place after the death of the Taheb, and it will be accompanied by the final judgement, when the righteous (and it may be assumed they are Samaritan) will go into the Garden of Eden, and the wicked (Jews and Gentiles alike) will be burned with fire. In the Liturgy, however, there are many references to the Samaritans' need for deliverance from distress and from their enemies: 'May He save thee and redeem thee from those to be acquainted with vengeance. . . . May He deliver thee from distress . . . may He cause this disfavour to depart.' (The following quotations may serve to show how the Taheb is referred to in the Liturgy: 'O God of the Taheb and his days. . . . May Yahweh thy God turn from thee the curse into the blessing with the coming of the Taheb and his favour . . . mayest thou raise up this altar in the days of the Taheb . . . may He prolong your lives unto the days of the Taheb. . . . We who mourn in tears for the days of favour and of the Taheb.' There is no clear indication as to whether the Taheb is Moses or 'one like unto Moses'.)

One interesting matter which has arisen out of the Samaritan studies concerns the dating of the Day of Pentecost. In Bible times the Feast of Pentecost seems to have been purely an agricultural festival. It is called the Feast of Harvest, the Day of Firstfruits and the Feast of Weeks. This last name was given because it was celebrated at the end of the seven weeks, which were to be counted from the time of the offering of the omer (Lev 23₁₅). It was held therefore on the fiftieth day (hence 'pentecost'). The Pharisees and the Sadducees disagreed as to the meaning of 'the morrow of the day of rest' from which the counting of the omer was to be begun. The Pharisees reckoned so that Passover always fell on the 14th Nisan, counting that day as a sabbath, and then counting fifty days, and so observing the Feast of Harvest on the 6th Sivan, no matter what day of the week it fell on. On the other hand the Sadducees waited till the sabbath following the 14th Nisan before counting their seven weeks, so the Feast of Harvest always fell on the Sunday after the Seventh Sabbath, i.e. seven weeks from the morrow of the sabbath after Passover. The opinion of the Sadducees is shared by the Karaites and by the Samaritans and by the Christian Church (though, of course, the dating of Easter and Whitsun is assessed in a different way from that used by the Jews). The association of Pentecost with the giving of the Law appears to have arisen in the inter-testamental period. The rabbis went through a closely reasoned argument to prove from the times mentioned in the story of the Exodus that the giving of the Law must have occurred fifty days after Passover—that is, on the Feast of Harvest. The Pharisees made Shabuot the anniversary of the giving of the Law on Sinai,

and so did the Samaritans, who called the Seventh Sabbath 'The Sabbath of the Words'. We have already noticed that the Samaritans have the same dating for the Feast of Harvest as the Sadducees. Can we argue from silence that the Sadducees also regarded Pentecost as the anniversary of the giving of the Law? If so, dare we go further and wonder whether there was the association in Old Testament times? Nowhere is the covenant renewed between God and Israel at Shabuot: when Ezra in Nehemiah 8 reads the Law it is Succot; and when Josiah in 2 Kings makes the covenant it is Pesach. On the other hand, in the Book of Jubilees (dating only, perhaps, in the second half of the last century B.C.) there are several interesting references to things which were supposed to have occurred on the Feast of Harvest: Isaac was born on that day (16₁₃); Abraham died (22₁); Judah was born (28₁₆); and Jacob and Laban bound themselves by mutual vows (29₇). It would seem that something like this happened about the keeping of the anniversary of the giving of the Law on Sinai on the Feast of Harvest. Finally, it is interesting to notice how the Samaritans name the sabbaths of Shabuot according to the major incidents which occurred in the wilderness wanderings immediately after the release from Egypt: they are Sabbath of the Sea, of Marah, of Elim, of Manna, of the Rock, of Amalek; and the seventh is the Sabbath of the Words.

As we have already said, it is probable that the original element of the Services of the Samaritan Liturgy was scriptural. Apart from the scriptural references which are to be repeated in full or in *qataf* (abbreviated) form, the Liturgy is made up of many different kinds of prayers composed by authors from the Fourth century A.D. to the Nineteenth century A.D. It has been a common practice of the scribes to leave out prayers and to include new compositions either by themselves or their relations quite freely. Apart from the *qatafim*¹ there usually appears at the end of the services a scripture reading which is appropriate to the day—on the First Sabbath the scripture reading is Exodus 14₂₅₋₃₁, which is the account of the passing through the Red Sea. Then certain portions of scripture are repeated in almost every Service, such as 'Then sang' (Ex 15₁₋₁₈), and 'Speak unto Aaron' (Num 6₂₂₋₂₇), and 'Hear, O Israel' (Dt 6₄), and the very popular refrain 'For in the name' (Dt 32₃₋₄). Other isolated verses of scripture appear quite commonly as refrains, or devout exclamations, such as 'Then Israel saw', 'Turn from Thy fierce wrath', 'Yahweh is mighty in battle' and 'Jacob came in peace'. These are the oldest elements, and to them were added hymns and prayers from what is now called the Old Defter (a sort of Book of Common Prayer) mostly by two authors called Durran and Marquah.

There are also two other fairly old types of compositions, the Declarations of Praise and the Poems (*miliphut*). The following is a good example of a Declaration of Praise:

In his greatness He delivered our fathers from Egypt with wonders, and He led them to the Red Sea, and they crossed through it gloriously, by the hand of the faithful prophet, the choicest of teachers. He is Moses, whom He informed, and whom He sent to be a deliverer of Israel. Thus Yahweh saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians.

They usually start thus and end with a scriptural quotation. The following

is an example of a *miliphut*: 'The Lord of oneness spake a great and stern word to the son of Amram, the great prophet Moses, in the plains of Moab: thou art he who is My prophet and My man. Speak unto Israel; speak well—it shall be done!' So to the Scriptural portions have been added the ancient prayers of the Defter and the later Declarations and Poems.

There have also been added the many, many hymns by many different authors over the past 1,500 years. They bear various names, such as *kime* hymn of praise, and song. The *kimes* are very numerous and seem usually to be composed of four parts: there is an opening preamble beginning with 'As the days of the heaven upon the earth' (from which, of course, they get their name); then there is a longer portion beginning with 'The God of Abraham', which contains references to the great characters of the Pentateuch, such as Abraham Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas, and Ithamar; the third section of the *kime* contains an account in poetic form of the incidents associated with the day on which it is to be said (for instance, in the *kimes* to be said on the First Sabbath we have the account of the passing through the Red Sea); and, finally, the fourth paragraph refers to the day by name—'This is the first sabbath . . .'. The following is a *kime* to be said on the Third Sabbath, which is the Sabbath of Elim.²

May the God of Abraham, the prince (Gen 23_a), help thee by His goodness. May the God of Isaac, who was preserved [Gen 22], be compassionate towards thee in His mercies. May the God of Jacob, the righteous one, restore thee in His greatness. May the God of Joseph, the king, cause thy glory to increase. May the God of Moses, the prophet, save thee and deliver thee. May the God of Aaron and his sons purify thee from all sin. May He strengthen thee against all that which thou fearest in thy evening and thy morning. With all manner of blessings may He bless both thee and thy son. With blessings may Yahweh bless thee and keep thee. Amen. I am that I am.

O God of gods! O Lord! O blessed One! O Thou who art alone and compassionate! Great is the judgment of God! He is the righteous wise One: everything knoweth His goodness. He beareth the life of those who repent. O Doer of wonders! O Creator! O righteous and eternal One! O Healer of those who hear Him! O strong One! There is no end, and there is no limit to Him who in the greatness of His wisdom created all things in six days, and blessed and sanctified the seventh day. He sanctified it, and made mighty its holiness. Then He raised up righteous ones from Adam. May peace be upon them! He chose Moses, the mighty prophet, from their seed; and He delivered His people by his hand from the hand of the man who was oppressing them, with signs and wonders, till Israel came out safely, as is said in the Law, 'And it came to pass the selfsame day, that Yahweh did bring . . . Israel out.' [Ex. 12₅₁]. For this our memorial is exalted.

After they had kept the Passover He went before Israel on the other side of the Red Sea. They crossed [it], and came out safely. Then they came to Marah, where there was made for them a statute and an ordinance [Ex. 15₂₅]. Then all the assembly of Israel came unto Elim [Ex. 15₂₇], where they stopped, and found therein springs of water and seventy palm trees, so that they could stop [there]. Our Lord blessed thy bread and water, and He hath sealed good things in His treasury. Therefore, O Yahweh, Thy name is to be blessed every night and day. Thou art the First of all, and Thou art the End of all. Amen. I am that I am.

May this the Third Sabbath be blessed upon you. May ye be filled with rejoicing as ye observe the holiness of every sabbath and set feast. May your applications

be received; may ye find prosperity in the work of your hands; may ye be fruitful as Ephraim and Manasseh; and may ye fulfil the divine favour upon the highest of all holy places. May there be established in your days the faith of the law of Moses. May your supplications be received, together with the prayers of those who serve in the house of Yahweh; and may ye be careful in keeping the commandments, which He made; and may God be with you in all that you do. Amen. I am that I am.

Then there follows the following sixteenth century Declaration of Praise by one Abraham *haftawi*:

O God of spirits, Thou art the One with whom there is no second, and Thou art the Power who remembered His covenant with the three fathers, who dwell in the cave [of Machpelah]. He delivered their sons from oppressions with wonders and signs, and He charged them with the numbering of seven sabbaths complete, by the hand of him to whom He spake from the bush. He is Moses by whose hand He caused us to know the statutes and the ordinances, and who led his people unto the camping place of Elim, even all who escaped [Ex. 15₂₇]. And they found there twelve springs of water, according to the number of tribes, and seventy palm trees, according to the number of the elders.

These are but two examples from the huge Samaritan Liturgy. The translation of the Services for Shabuot (which include two for each Sabbath and several for the 'holy' week preceding the Seventh Sabbath and the Feast of Harvest) runs into some 550 typed quarto pages, and that without most of the *qatafim* being given in full. It is most unlikely that the whole of the Liturgy will ever be printed in full in translation, for its literary and spiritual value is not so great as its historic worth. Still, for those who are really interested, it is no really great effort to study them in the remarkable mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic as published by the Clarendon Press in 1909.³

¹ See article 'The Samaritans and their Liturgy' published in this journal in October 1958.

² The rubric just here reads 'And there is said "Great is God, etc."' Then they finish the qataf of the Law as is customary, and after it there is said 'Yahweh is a God' (from the Defter), and the following *kime* composed by the priest Joseph (sixteenth century) 'May the favour of Yahweh be upon him. Amen.'

³ *The Samaritan Liturgy*, edited by A. E. Cowley, in two volumes, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1909.

JOHN NEWTON AND THE MINISTRY

Harry Parkin

JOHN NEWTON was ordained in 1764 at the age of thirty-eight; for sixteen years he served in the parish of Olney, where he met Cowper. In 1779 he removed to the parish of St Mary Woolnoth and St Mary Woolchurch-Haw in Lombard Street. There he ministered until he died in 1807, and even when he was over eighty years of age preached regularly. Young ministers and candidates for the ministry engaged his special interest while he was at St Mary's, as indicated by Richard Cecil. 'Being of the most friendly and communicative disposition, his house was open to Christians of all ranks and denominations. Here, like a father among his children, he used to entertain, encourage, and instruct his friends; especially younger ministers, or candidates for the ministry'.¹ This interest was no mere adjunct to his pastoral work, as is shown by his serious treatment of various aspects of the ministry.

Newton lived in a time when men often entered the ministry because of family traditions or because the Church offered, given favourable patronage, financial security and comfort. Such reasons were widely accepted and approved. But not by Newton. For him there could only be one reason for entering the ministry, the call of God. 'It is he [Christ] who raises up instruments to preach his Gospel, appoints them their places, furnishes them with that measure of gifts and sufficiency which he sees requisite and best'.²

John Newton never forgot that it was through God's providential intervention that he was rescued from his wretched state of 'slavery' in Africa and prepared for the work of the ministry. He also knew that only the divine call provided sufficient means of discharging the ministerial office. 'For the ministry must be a wearisome and discouraging service, unless we are clear that God has called and appointed us to it'.³

In that same letter he touches upon the difficulty of what constitutes a call to the ministry. Doubtless the young ministers who gathered informally at his home in Coleman Street Buildings had often discussed this topic. 'Many have been desirous to preach the Gospel; but that desire alone does not amount to a divine call.'

Some eight years earlier, in another letter, he had given his definition of a proper call to the ministry.

- (1) A warm and earnest desire to be employed in this service.
- (2) There must in due season appear some competent sufficiency as far as gifts, knowledge and utterance.
- (3) A correspondent opening in Providence, by a gradual train of circumstances pointing out the means, the time, the place of actually entering upon the work.⁴

Although that letter was written within a year of his ordination, he had waited six years for 'the correspondent opening in Providence', his first application for ordination to the Archbishop of York having been rejected in 1758.

John Newton himself had had little formal education, having left the boarding school at Stratford, after two years there, when he was ten years old to go to

sea with his father. Of formal theological training he had none. He once said in conversation, 'My course of study, like that of a surgeon, has principally consisted in walking the hospital'. Nevertheless, he had strong and sound ideas about ministerial training, although some of his suggestions may appear rather stringent today. In 'A Plan of Academical Preparation for the Ministry', dated 14th May 1782 he lays down rules commendable for their practical viewpoint at least. Without advocating 'a monkish austerity', he suggests that students 'be accustomed to prefer a plain and frugal manner of life', because 'A propensity to indulgence in the quantity and quality of food, is a meanness unworthy of a man and scandalous in a minister'. Newton demands 'a propriety in dress' because a 'finical disposition in this article not only occasions a waste of time and expense, but is a token of a trifling turn of mind'. Believing that early morning is the time of day 'most favourable to study or devotion' and that sitting up late is 'a hurtful and proposterous custom', he requires that 'a habit of rising early should be resolutely formed'. Then he touches upon a most delicate matter. The tutor 'cannot be too careful to prevent them from forming any female connexions while under his roof', because he thinks that 'Love and courtship are by no means favourable to study, nor indeed to devotion' at a period when circumstances 'render a settlement by marriage improper, if not impracticable'. Lest much study weary the flesh, Newton counsels that 'Relaxation and exercise are therefore necessary'. He suggests 'riding where it can be conveniently practised'. Failing that, he strongly advocates walking, which 'requires neither expense nor preparation'. In order to provide some definite objective to the exercise, he counsels the tutor to send his students to visit, 'some of the Lord's poor, who live at convenient distances'. He does not define the latter.

Regarding the content of theological training, he offers, in a letter addressed to 'A Student of Divinity', four guiding principles. (a) 'The original Scriptures well deserve your pains and will richly repay them.' To this he adds the warning that mastery of grammatical construction is not commensurate with spiritual understanding. (b) The study of logic 'will much assist you in composing and speaking properly and acceptably'. (c) 'Study the living as well as the dead, or rather more'. By this he means engage in conversation with experienced Christians. (d) 'You will find advantage by attending as much as you can on those preachers whom God has blessed with much power, life, and success in their ministry'. The goal of such attendance is to observe their excellencies and faults.

Most of the suggestions which Newton makes on this subject are universally approved and accepted by those who, two centuries later, train ministers. One point, however, may be disputed. He commends the art of preaching extempore because it is the means of commanding and engaging the attention of congregations, and also because 'It saves much time, which might be usefully employed in visiting'. By extempore preaching he does not mean unprepared preaching, but the disciplined practise of preaching without notes.⁵

These ideas were determined by Newton's opinion of the incomparable nature of the work of the ministry. He once wrote: 'A minister of Jesus Christ is as high a style as mortal man can attain.'⁶ But he knew very well that this honour involved hardships. Thus he wrote in one of his letters: 'The work of

the ministry is truly honourable; but like the post of honour in a battle, it is attended with peculiar dangers⁷ and he once said: 'The post of honour in an army is not with the baggage, nor with the women.'

Although he repeatedly affirmed the high honour of the ministry, Newton always remembered that a minister was a man among men: 'As ministers, we preach to those who have like passions and infirmities with ourselves.'⁸ He saw that sympathy was therefore a necessary part of the minister's equipment. 'For the like reason he appoints his ministers to be sorely exercised both from without and within, that they may sympathize with their flock, and know in their hearts the deceitfulness of sin, the infirmities of the flesh, and the way in which the Lord supports and bears with all that trust in him.'⁹ Such common experience provides special authority, 'So he [the Holy Spirit] ordinarily restrains his blessing to those ministers who have themselves experienced the power of the truths which they deliver to others.'¹⁰

John Newton believed that if the human instruments chosen by God are properly trained by the Church, and if they themselves properly discipline their gifts, the result would be effective ministers of God to men. For him the work of the minister concerned the whole man:

'I measure ministers by square measure. I have no idea of the size of a table, if you tell me how *long* it is; but, if you also say how *wide*, I can tell its dimensions. So, when you tell me what a man is in the pulpit, you must also tell me what he is out of it, or I shall not know his size.'¹¹

¹ *The Works of John Newton*, I.73.

² *ibid.*, II.433, sermon on 'Of the Authority of Christ' on Mt 11:27.

³ *ibid.*, VI.100, Letter No. 17, dated 20th April 1773.

⁴ *ibid.*, II.44, Letter No. 1, dated 7th March 1765.

⁵ *ibid.*, V.83, 'A Plan of Academical Preparation'.

⁶ *ibid.*, VI.100, Letter No. 17, dated 20th April 1773.

⁷ *ibid.*, I.161, Letter No. 5, 'On the Snares and Difficulties Attending the Ministry'.

⁸ *ibid.*, I.665, Letter No. 3, dated 13th June 1772.

⁹ *ibid.*, II.71, Letter No. 6, dated 29th July 1761.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, II.213, Chapter II, 'A Review of Ecclesiastical History'.

¹¹ *ibid.*, I.106, 'Remarks made in familiar conversation'.

PERSONALITY IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

William D. Robinson

MOST OF US in these days pass through periods when it seems that we, as individuals, do not matter. We have our beliefs and our values, but collective impersonalism seems to be the order of the day. Our thoughts and ideals do not seem to have the slightest chance of being realized, unless it so happens that 50 million other people share them. Very largely, the day of effective individual action appears to have gone. In industry the say is with collective bargaining, the central committee, and the block vote. In the House the important factor is the party line rather than the individual opinion.

Added to this is the fact that so much work today has become impersonal. The day of the individual craftsman has given way to that of mass production, ironing out the individual characteristics of the products as well as of the producers. Minding machines is a great part of the life of our working people. Even in our 'nation of small shopkeepers' the personal business is being overshadowed by the multiple store. Perhaps the cults of the anti-conformists and of those who go to absurd lengths in their 'worship' of various odd personalities are symptomatic proof, if any is required, of the pressure of conventionalism and conformism in our age.

We in the West tend naturally to think of the totalitarian collectivism of Communism as the chief threat to 'our way of life'. Yet discerning leaders are daily pointing out that the real enemy of Christianity and of any way of life based on the Christian faith is that materialism which is to be found in Western Christendom just as much as in Eastern Communism. The frontal attack on the personality involved in brainwashing and indoctrination may blind us to the flank assault which materialism makes in setting up the cult of the thing, not only against God, but against everything which is truly personal.

A great deal of recent Continental philosophy is best understood as a revolt against this impersonalism. Existentialism and the Personalism of E. Mounier, together with the thinking of Lavelle and Le Senne, are clearly attempts to understand life from the point of view of the human person as he is in his most personal aspects—in his moral choices and responsibilities.

Science has always been dominated by physics. The 'new biology' of the latter part of the nineteenth century has not really freed us from a materialistic view of the world or from a mechanical approach to the human being itself. When science examines human personality, psychology can take no account of—and therefore all too easily and frequently denies—that freedom/responsibility that core of human experience, that makes a man a person. The Existentialist and kindred thinkers protest against this tendency of science to treat the human being as just another thing (F. Copleston, *Contemporary Philosophy*).

With this part of the philosopher's protest the Christian must surely agree. Without taking the invidious step of tying Christianity to any particular philosophy (as, e.g., Bultmann), we must surely state that if the gospel is to mean

anything it must assume that tenet of idealism that the world is the 'vale of soul-making' (Bosanquet, *Value and Destiny of the Individual*—but with different conclusions!). That the purpose of Creation as we know it is at least the creation of free moral persons appears to me to be intrinsic to our faith. Indeed, the Christian Church in its finest hours has always opposed anything that tended to depersonalise the human being, and this because it was a direct consequence of its gospel.

Rudolph Bultmann has classified communities into four groups:

(a) The natural community rooted in blood and soil, of which the family and the nation are examples; (b) The historical community, which arises out of common experiences and common tasks (the State is the obvious example here); (c) The cultural community founded upon a common body of ideas, whether they be scientific, philosophical or artistic; (d) The religious community which is based on faith (J. Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology*, p.215f).

'The presupposition of a genuine community he [i.e. Bultmann] believes is selfhood. The community must ensure the freedom and responsibility of personality' (ibid. p.216).

The danger to the community is depersonalization. The Nazi doctrine of 'blood and soil', the apparatus of the totalitarian state, and dogmatism, or the fixation of ideas, are examples of degeneration in the first three of these four types of community.

Naturally, our main interest centres on the fourth type of community—the Church. Here the dangers are all too obvious. They are—to use J. Macquarrie's list (ibid., pp.221f.):

1. That the Church tends to usurp what rightly belongs to the individual. (a) The Church has too frequently taken away from the individual the real possibility of decision. It can make the Gospel a tradition to be unthinkingly accepted. (b) The Church may destroy that freedom which belongs to the life of faith by multiplying the rules which are inevitable in any organized body. 2. It may become marvellously efficient as a mechanism and yet be completely deficient in fellowship and in the other marks of the life of faith.

This brings us to the core of our subject. Is our Church life so ordered that it serves the purpose of 'soul-making', of creating free personalities? To quote Macquarrie once more

There are some things that the believer must understand and do for himself, if his faith is authentic, and the tendency, even in Protestant churches, has been for the Church to encroach on the sphere which rightly belongs to the individual (ibid. p.222).

Our people, from Monday to Saturday, are surrounded by the pressures of impersonalism. What do they find on Sunday? (And, of course, this applies equally to our week-night work, where, if anything, opportunities to experiment are greater.) 'Our pattern of Church life has involved, far too often, meetings of an impersonal character, i.e. a character in which the individual is not required to or able to respond as a person' (H. A. Hamilton, 'Religious Education', *Expository Times*, February 1960). If our Church community life is to achieve its purpose of helping human beings to grow into real persons through meeting with other persons on a personal level, and to bring them

into the I-Thou relationship with The Person, then there must be opportunity for personal individual activity.

A Methodist local preacher recently mentioned that she often found it more of a strain to talk with people afterwards than actually to conduct a meeting. A service can be extremely impersonal; you may treat a congregation on an impersonal level. How often, then, the more exhausting personal fellowship is lost or overlooked.

We are always being told that the genius of early Methodism was its Class Meeting. Today, with notable exceptions, it is largely without it. May it not be true to say that Methodism is now more individualistic, and as a result has lost its individualism. Sub-personal mediocrity is becoming the rule in the community of faith as well as in secular society.

Yet how can personalities find themselves unless they first find each other? It is a fundamental law of human nature that man cannot grow into self-conscious selfhood until he recognizes himself as a member of a community of other selves. This fact is widely understood and used today in many walks of life. In education, in the treatment of criminals, and in mental therapeutics, the group method is being vigorously studied and extensively employed (Cf., e.g., Foulkes and Anthony, *Group Psychotherapy*). Remembering that new times demand new forms of expression, may we not yet hope that the discovery of the need and efficiency of 'fellowship' in these secular realms may lead us to rediscover our own hidden treasure?

There are meetings of ministers, and meetings of lay preachers—to say nothing of other committees—where the pressure of business, or the formality of its conduct, is so great that not only are 'first things' crowded out, but the personalities of its individuals are never allowed to emerge and engage. There are some churches which are hives of activity, yet in which fellowship on any real personal level is non-existent, or even regarded as not needed—'just another meeting'.

Yet there is hope—in the pattern of house-parties now emerging, in the growing realization of the need for something in the place of the old Class Meeting, in the slowly growing practice of 'activity' in all but the most backward of Sunday Schools, and in the leadership of ministers and local preachers who, where other forms are absent, have themselves come together to form groups for personal fellowship—that, against the tide of materialism, collectivism and impersonalism, the Church may make an effective witness to the fact that though man can make his own chains, he can also, through the fellowship of the Spirit, live a personal, free, responsible and authentic existence, even in the twentieth century.

NORMAN NICHOLSON—A CONTEMPORARY CHRISTIAN POET

Frederic Vanson

OF ALL THE MANY poets who achieved notice and publication during the years of the last war and those which immediately followed, many have inevitably lapsed into obscurity, for there are always more competent poets than good ones. Of these writers, however, a few stronger talents survive and have continued into our present decade to produce poetry which is not merely competent and readable, but original and creative. Of this small band one of the most noticeable is Norman Nicholson, the Lakeland poet and author, a writer who has never gone in for startling innovations in language and technique, whose work is firmly based in tradition, yet is wholly modern in spirit. He is notable too as one of the very few first-rate poets writing today who is a professing and active Christian.

A full survey of Mr Nicholson's work would, I think, need to consider three major aspects of his writing: his prominence as a 'regional' writer who knows, loves and expresses the soul of his native landscape, his work as a dramatist in verse which has added distinction to the verse drama, and, finally, his work as a propagandist for the Christian faith in the medium of poetry. This latter is a task of peculiar difficulty in the middle of this sceptical and materialistic century.

In a brief article such as this it is manifestly impossible to do justice to all these themes. All that I may hope to do is to introduce the reader to Nicholson's poetry (ignoring for the sake of brevity his dramas) and hope that he may be moved to discover for himself the pleasures and profundities of this most readable and knowable of contemporary Christian poets. It is an undertaking well worth the trouble, for Mr Nicholson has much to teach us, conveys his message without apparent effort, in a straightforward and uncomplicated style, and is able memorably to communicate his spiritual convictions. His work is one more splendid attempt to 'justify the ways of God to man'.

Norman Nicholson has always, I think, been a conscious propagandist for the Christian faith. His view of what constitutes religious poetry is worth quoting as an authoritative key to his own work. In his Preface to his *Penguin Anthology of Religious Verse* he wrote:

Many people think of religious poetry as moral uplift in rhyme or pious verse about the Good Shepherd—the literary equivalent of the pictures distributed by Sunday Schools at Christmas and Easter. There is no need to despise such verses or to doubt the sincerity of those who write or enjoy them, but, to the more critical reader, the use of conventional images and worn out phrases seems to imply that Christianity itself is no longer a living thing.

The religiosity of the worst kind of Christian poetaster Norman Nicholson has, as a genuine poet, always and easily avoided. His own approach is vivid,

contemporary and forthright. It is developed from very ordinary and everyday themes and uses an often colloquial speech, and his occasional 'conceits' are always apposite and striking.

Brambles are in fruit again.
Their little nigger fists they clench
And hold the branches in a clinch. . . .

or, again

When the housewife wind and rain
Rubs the berries spick and span.

This colloquial and vivid speech has its startling moments—

Grant us to know that hours rushed by
Are photographed upon God's eye;
That life and leaf are both preserved
In gelatine of Jesus' blood.

Such imagery, however, is certainly no bolder than much employed by Donne and Herbert, and how true is the underlying thought that these 'conceits' reveal!

A splendid example of this power to revivify and re-create the familiar by these means is the *Carol for Holy Innocents' Day*:

The cat was let out of the bag by an angel
Who warned them and planned their getaway,
And told them how Herod would make holy with death
The day that a birth made a holy day.
Herod's men were searching the back alleys,
They did not see the refugees go,
Nor how when the child's hands fluttered like sparrows
His fingers blest the casual snow.

Mr Nicholson's reputation as a lyric poet was made by *Five Rivers*, a book which exhibits admirably the chief features of his work—his intense love of the North Country and his deep Christian conviction, features which are not kept in watertight compartments and embodied in separate poems, but are frequently fused together. As a Christian he often feels compelled to treat of social and economic matters, as in the poem, *Egremont*:

The autumnal sunlight drips
On chimney, pit-shafts, rubble tips.
Centuries of feudal weight
Have made men stoop towards their feet.
They climb no rocks nor stare around,
But dig their castles in the ground.

'Chimneys, pit-shafts, rubble tips.' This landscape of the industrial north-west, of Furness and West Cumberland, is Nicholson's home ground. He was born at Millom, a small industrial town, a place with no history beyond the Industrial Revolution, mushroomed out of nothing. Yet such is the power of his imagination and the acuteness of his perception that he can create from this

unpromising background the stuff of art, pointing an eternal and a universally valid moral.

He has a deep understanding, too, of the folk of this region which in the prosperous and literary South is unknown or forgotten:

Neat
Is the rough-cast, and the doors set back
Deep in the doorways, alternate numbers
Brassed on the boards above the lock—
And not a neighbour now remembers
That the eighth or ninth house from the end
Was not built with the street, but stood a farm
Two hundred years on its own land,
And the rest of the street was shunted firm
Against it when the town was made on the mosses.

Note here the intense local knowledge, the loving absorption in the minutiae of the town's history and topography. Note also the simple vigour of the phrasing—'shunted firm against it', 'alternate numbers/Brassed on the boards'—recalling the expressive but everyday vigour of Northern speech.

So much by way of description of the little town. But the poet sees not only its present aspect and its past history; he relates the houses and the street to a whole landscape, a whole complex of geographical and geological facts:

Yet a dream
Grips at the house when the roofs are asleep,
True to the loins of the rock that bred it.
When the slag
Is puddled across the clouds, and curlews fly
Above the chimneys, the walls thrust like a crag
Through the dark tide of haematite in the night sky.

Thus the twentieth-century iron furnaces are directly linked to the antiquity of the rocks, but we do not find the leap unnatural or the symbolism strained.

This vivid sense of place, a quality which Nicholson shares with such very different writers as Hardy, Lawrence (D. H.) and Louis Macneice, is responsible for a striking and unique feature of his religious poetry and drama. Just as the medieval painter depicted his Virgins and his Magi in the costume of the Middle Ages, so does this poet—albeit more consciously, and for artistically more sophisticated ends—dress Biblical events in the garb of Cumberland and the Lakeland fells. An example of this is the poem, *Naaman*, which is based on the Biblical story of the Syrian commander (2 K 5). The details as recorded in the Old Testament are well known—Naaman becomes a leper and is told by Elisha to bathe seven times in the Jordan; at first he is sceptical, and asks if a Damascan river would not do equally well, but on obeying the prophet's injunction is immediately healed. In Mr Nicholson's version of the story, however, there is no mention of Jordan; the river is unmistakably a Lakeland stream, and indeed the whole scene is Cumbrian. Yet the dramatic force is not lost. On the contrary, by this very bold 'translation' of landscape and a similar 'translation' of the era, the story grows in immediacy and power.

So this is the river! Cold and still as steel,
 curved round the banks and boulders. Small cascades
 Are bent like blades of ploughs and stand as stiffly.
 Unceasing movement now is grey and steady
 As the dead stone. The roots of thorns
 Are plated with the wetness, and lichens nailed
 On the rocks like lead. There's not a clipping
 Even, of a ragwort's faded hair
 Left in this winter water.

A vivid picture this, but not, surely, of Jordan! The thoughts of the sufferer, too, are expressed in the language of today, ordinary to a fault, though vigorous. This is the unadorned common speech which Wordsworth advised, but did not always practise.

A lad came out, a red-haired lout,
 Chewing a stalk of dry brown grass. He said
 The old man said for me to please
 Wash my hands in the river. That was all.
 He went off spitting the grass into the mud.

And again:

Would not the tap
 Give a better lather than this rocky gutter?
 I was a fool to come.

It is this power to present the great truths of our faith and the deep involvement of all human and natural life in the life of the Creator in a fresh, compelling and wholly convincing way that is the peculiar strength of Norman Nicholson's work, and his outstanding contribution to religious poetry in our time. He is no revolutionary, melting down and recasting language like a Dylan Thomas or a James Joyce. Although both Nicholson and Thomas are poets with an intense love of places and a deep compassion for the inhabitants of their native landscapes, the methods they employ are (though equally valid) very different. Thomas wrestles with language, and, having conquered it, makes it sing to a rare and wonderful music as in the magnificent *Fern Hill* or the unforgettable *And Death Shall Have No Dominion*. Nicholson employs a largely traditional framework and is content to give strength and power to his poems by simpler means—by using, with the ear of a poet, the language of daily and common life. His work derives a little perhaps from the Metaphysicals, but embeds their starting imagery within a Wordsworthian simplicity (which, however, never perpetrates the extreme silliness of Wordsworth's too-deliberately contrived rustics and simples, who surely never were on land or sea!

With Norman Nicholson's poetry one comes to feel that one knows the writer, for the work is the man, a man of perhaps uncomplicated faith, vigorous, sincere, rooted firmly in the rocks of his much-loved region, a man compassionate for others, and acquainted intimately with a landscape which he can make fruitful and significant, where others see only much empty space and much soiling industry. His work is a living proof that the art of poetry is very far from being dead, and that in our day a Christian poetry is not only possible but is being written.

THE BODY SNATCHERS

W. S. Penn

THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY was a lively time in the criminal world where the notorious prison at Newgate and the gallows at Tyburn played a major part. The early surgeons profited from this activity utilizing the bodies of the malefactors for their experiments. Their activities are vividly illustrated from an incident recorded by Silas Told in his autobiography.

'A company of eight sailors, with truncheons in their hands, looked up to the gallows with an angry countenance, the bodies having been cut down some minutes previous to their arrival. An old woman, who sold gin, observing them to grow violent, by reason of their disappointment, mildly said, "Gentlemen, I suppose you want the man that the surgeons have got." "Ay," replied the sailors, "where is he?" She told them that the surgeon's crew had carried them over to Paddington, and pointed out to them the road thither. They hastened away, and as they entered the town, inquired where the surgeon's mob was. On receiving the information they wanted, they went and demanded the body of John Lancaster. When they had obtained it, two of them took him on their shoulders, and carried it round by Islington. They being tired, two others laid themselves under the body, and carried it from thence to Shoreditch; then two more carried it from Shoreditch to Coverlet's-fields; at length, after they were all weary, and unable to carry it farther, they agreed to lay it on the step of the first door they came to. They did so, and went their way. This gave birth to a great riot in the neighbourhood, which brought an old woman, who had lived in the house, down stairs. When she saw the corpse at the step of the door, she cried out, "Lord, here is my son, John Lancaster!" This being spread abroad, the Methodists made a collection, and got him a shroud and a coffin. This event was the more singular, as the seaman had no knowledge of the body, nor to whom he belonged when living. My second wife went with me to see him previous to the burial; but neither of us could perceive the least alteration in his visage or features, or any appearance of violence on any part of his body. A pleasant smile appeared in his countenance, and he lay as in a sweet sleep.'

THE BARBER-SURGEONS

The barbers or barber-surgeons were incorporated in 1461, but long before that they were performing the double and perhaps allied functions of shaving and healing wounds. The surgeon was frequently engaged in blood-letting, for which purpose the patient had to hold the 'barber's pole', which, when not in use, was wrapped with a bandage, symbolised later by the coloured spiral band of the present-day barber.

A surgeon had to be a member of the corporation to carry out his work. However, as obviously had to happen, the surgeons severed their connection with the barbers in 1743 and set up a rival organisation. But both were allowed to practise as surgeons and there was conflict for some time.

Both Corporations required bodies for dissection, and the difficulty in obtaining suitable specimens led to much fighting. The public regarded the situation with detached amusement, and it seems from contemporary literature that it was all taken as a matter of course, there being nothing at all gruesome in the situation.

The surgeons required bodies for their work and often had to obtain them as best they could. A decree of 1752 stated that the bodies of executed murderers should be sent as soon as possible to the Barber-Surgeon's Hall in the Old Bailey in order that they might be dissected.

In spite of this decree, however, the supply was not sufficient. Other means had to be adopted of obtaining them and these were usually illegal. The so-called 'resurrection women' used to follow the processions to Tyburn and obtain bodies in a more or less legal manner, but the 'body snatchers' were all engaged in illegal activities. They were the smugglers of the City of London.

Until 1832, when the Anatomy Act was passed, no licence was required for the opening of an anatomical school. At the same time there was no provision for supplying the students with bodies for dissection. Indirectly, therefore, the authorities were responsible for the activities of the body snatchers whom they tried to suppress.

All of this activity took place in a well-defined district. The prisoners were kept in Newgate Prison, on the site of the present Old Bailey, and taken for execution down Snow Hill, along Holborn and Oxford Street to Tyburn, near Marble Arch. After execution the bodies were brought back along the same route to burial or to the Surgeon's Hall. After 1783, when Tyburn finished, the executions took place outside Newgate, and then all the activities took place in that vicinity.

THE RESURRECTION WOMEN

The resurrection women were employed by the surgeons to obtain bodies. Usually they impersonated the parents of the malefactors, since in this way they drew less attention to themselves. Their task was not always an easy one.

Frequently the women, as 'relatives', would dress up in black to follow the procession. Often they would have hackney coaches to add weight to their deception. If, after the execution of a malefactor, there were no friends or relatives to claim the body (and this was often the case) then the resurrection women could have it. Even if the relatives were there, the resurrection women, in desperation, might still try to take the body, and in such cases lively fights developed.

The law was that from the moment of 'turning off' (the cart at Tyburn) the body had to hang for one hour before it could be cut down. The competition was so keen that the cutting down took place more quickly than this, which caused trouble with the authorities and at least one unexpected result. In 1740, William Duell was hanged for murder, and after his body had been cut down it was handed over to the surgeons who took it to their hall. It was stripped and laid on the board by one of the college servants, who then proceeded to wash it in preparation for dissection. Suddenly the 'body' sat up, and after the servant had recovered from his surprise, he called a surgeon

who effected a complete recovery. Duell was later condemned to transportation for life. Several other cases of this kind have been recorded.

The resurrection women did not always rush to their job as a contemporary account tells us. 'Two elderly women, decently dressed in black crepe, with their faces veiled over like a woman of quality, were cursed by a surgeon as they passed down the stairs, who withal said, they had lain as long in bed as a Welch dean, and there was hardly a possibility of their having time to get to the gallows to do their duty'.

THE BODY SNATCHERS

The body snatchers were an undesirable set of individuals whose activities were quite illegal. They obtained their supply of bodies as best they could, which usually meant from churchyards. They used to wait until the funeral was over and then return at night to dig up the body, the nocturnal diggers frequently being in league with the official grave-diggers.

At one time, St Sepulchre's Church, near Newgate, had a large churchyard which particularly attracted the body snatchers. The parishioners naturally objected to losing the bodies of their friends and relatives; consequently a watch tower was built there in 1791, but it was destroyed in the blitz.

The body snatchers were properly organized. The raids were well planned in conjunction with the grave diggers and the bodies were carefully stored afterwards. At the corner of Cock Lane, formerly known as Pie Corner, which was situated behind St Sepulchre's Church, stood a tavern known as the 'Fortune of War'. This inn was the headquarters of the resurrectionists and body snatchers. On the walls of the back room of the inn were exhibited the bodies of the recently disinterred victims, each tidily labelled with the name of the body snatcher who had obtained the corpse. They were waiting until the surgeons of St Bartholomew's Hospital opposite came to select the bodies they wanted.

Mourners were not surprisingly very concerned about the disinterment of bodies, and the Gentleman's Magazine for 1754 offers some practical advice on 'An Easy Way to Secure Dead Bodies in their Graves'. The instructions state that as soon as the body has been placed in the grave, it should be covered with a truss of straw. A layer of earth should be placed on top, followed by more straw, and so on. It was claimed that this technique made digging much more difficult.

Sometimes the possession of a body proved to be an embarrassment. When three highwaymen were executed in April 6th 1739, one of whom had been a shoe-maker, the surgeons tried to claim the bodies, but the representatives of the Guild of Shoemakers were there and rescued their colleague's body, carrying it home in triumph to the widow. She, however, was not to be found, and the shoe makers were so annoyed that they hawked the body about for some hours to all the apothecaries 'at a very cheap rate'. However, they could find no purchaser and eventually buried it in St George's Field.

CRIME DOES NOT PAY

Once the surgeons had the body they required, it was used for anatomical

research. The bodies of executed murderers were dissected in public as a sort of 'crime does not pay' idea. These scenes were not regarded as at all untoward and people from all walks of life went to see them.

A Mr Hackman, Rector of Wiverton, in Norfolk, who was executed for murder in 1779 was one of the unfortunates thus treated. There are several eye witness accounts of this, the briefest being by Dr John Warner, Rector of Stourton in Wiltshire, who when writing to his friend George Augustus Selwyn said 'Mr Hackman has been tried, condemned and executed, and is now a fine corpse at Surgeon's Hall, where I saw him yesterday—a genteel, well-made young fellow of four and twenty. There has been a great deal of butchery in the case'.

The dissection finished the cycle of events which started when the malefactor committed a crime. He was tried, condemned, hanged, taken by the resurrection women or body snatchers and dissected. He had then fully completed his useful function on earth.

UNREALIZED ESCHATOLOGY

Roderic Dunkerley

THAT JESUS HOPED for a response to His Message of the Kingdom which was not given and that He felt a sense of frustration and disappointment because something in the will of God was not happening is an aspect of truth which has not been worthily discussed by modern scholars. An exceptional example was Cecil John Cadoux, whose massive book, *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, was unfortunate in its time of publication (1941), during some of the darkest days of the war. It was often, I fear, put on one side for more careful consideration at some later time which never came, and far less vital works were given precedence. His lamented death in 1947 robbed us of one of our finest scholars and of the fuller defence of his thesis which he would have elaborated had he lived. I urge that this theme ought now to be reopened.

We may recall the three crucial 'Lament' passages in the Gospels on which Cadoux placed very great importance, (Mt. 2²⁰⁻⁴, 23^{37, 38}—with the Lucan parallels; and Lk. 19⁴¹⁻⁴) and the allied passages in which the same emphasis is very clearly expressed. I have discussed these passages in various articles and especially in my book, *The Hope of Jesus* (1953). I do not propose to repeat Cadoux's arguments and my own, but there is one corollary from the general theme which it is vital that we should draw. Ought we not to ask what might have—and what should have taken place?

John Buchan once wrote, 'Hypothetics is at its best a barren game', but I am not sure that he was right, and in the present case I suggest there are important issues at stake. Of course, we cannot have more than the merest glimpse

of the answer to the question, yet to turn a blind eye to it may lead to a warped and stunted theology. I find Dodd's argument at this point singularly inadequate. He emphasizes what he calls 'the eschatology of woe' in the sayings of Jesus, but says that there is very little if any trace of an 'eschatology of bliss' to balance it, as in the Old Testament prophets. Now, if he simply means that there is no description in the gospels of a national or world-wide order of blessedness—God's will being done on earth as it is in heaven, after the sufferings and sorrows which He forecast were coming to pass—then this is probably true, though the fact that He taught men to pray that that should happen is surely significant. But there is I submit a prior question: Is there not what we may call an 'eschatology of bliss refused', which is deeply embedded in the Lament texts and other passages where his disappointment is so evident? And is not this the real counterpart to the dooms which He pronounced and the real parallel to the Utopian pictures of blessedness on earth in which the prophets delighted?

It has not been usual of late to stress either the fact or the importance of the prophetic vision of the future, probably because an undue emphasis has been placed upon the apocalypticism which developed later. But it cannot be too strongly urged that the real spiritual heritage of Jesus was in the Old Testament and not in Enoch and his fellows. Dr H. L. Goudge said that 'The Book of Enoch may surely claim a place among the world's hundred worst books; it was too much even for the Jewish Rabbis; and I would as soon take my theology from Zadkiel's Almanac.' Certainly the prophets who meant so much to Jesus, as we know from the Gospels, constantly pictured the bliss which it was God's will should be enjoyed on earth—why is this side of their message so commonly ignored by scholars today? The Hebrew Utopia was depicted and discussed by Dr Walter Adeney many years ago;

No words can describe the glory and the beauty, the grand perfection and the sweet comfort, of that marvellous age of which prophet after prophet came forward to utter some fresh prediction. Plato's model Republic and Sir Thomas More's Utopia are cheerless and uninviting beside this ravishing dream of the future. Even St John's inspired vision of the New Jerusalem and Dante's poetic descriptions of the bliss of the great central rose of heaven, do not promise more blessedness than these prophets portrayed, often as hovering just beyond their horizon, but always as certain to be enjoyed in this weary world at the fitting time.

This may sound an over-enthusiastic statement, but that some hope for the future, related to these longings and anticipations of the prophets, was in the heart of Jesus as He began His ministry I find it impossible to doubt. And this helps us to understand a little of the significance of the disappointment and frustration which came upon Him later.

Two particular points may be mentioned at which we see clearly the hopes of Jesus regarding what-might-have-been shining through the unhappiness of what actually took place. There is first, the word 'peace' in Luke 19₄₂—'the things which belong unto thy peace'. If they had received Him instead of rejecting Him an era of peace would have dawned—surely this would have been bliss indeed! If they had accepted His wise counsel and chosen the path of friendship with the Roman oppressors instead of friction, they would have been spared all the horrors and devastation of war and the way would have

opened for the joys and achievements of peaceful co-existence. At the cost of national pride and honour and independence—impossible, human nature says! But 'the foolishness of God is wiser than men', let us remember.

And, secondly, there is the acted parable of the Entry, quite obviously based on the words in Zechariah 9, 10:

Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy king cometh unto thee; he is just and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off, and he shall speak peace unto the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth.

Here we have the glorious promise of peace dramatically expressed, with the further anticipation of divine rule and righteousness spreading throughout the world. To suggest that Jesus acted in this way without these thoughts in His mind and with no intention of implying that such blessings were in the purpose of God seems to me entirely unreasonable. Here, surely, is an eschatology of bliss!

Interesting and impressive confirmation of this thesis is found in Professor John Macmurray's fine book, *The Clue to History*. He states the purpose of Jesus thus:

It is clear that Jesus conceived his task, as the prophets had conceived theirs, as being to recall the nation to their allegiance to God, and so into line with the divine purpose which was incarnate in their history. . . . The mission of Jesus to his own people is to reveal to them what has been implicit in their cultural history from the beginning, to declare to them what they are called to do and to demand their acceptance of the task and its conditions. . . . 'In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.' The whole world is to be redeemed through the Jews. Their history is the story of the revelation of the intention of God and the laws of his action in human history. With the completion of this revelation comes the call to the Jewish people to accept the will of God as their own, and to act as the light of the nations. What did this mean in the contemporary situation for Jesus and his people? It meant, in the first place, that they should not take up arms against Rome.

Discussing the question of eschatology and apocalyptic, Macmurray says:

There is more to be said for the view that Jesus expected the internal disruption of the Roman Empire to happen much more quickly than it did; and that he expected that the self-destruction of Rome would lead to the final establishment of a universal society based on equality and freedom. . . . In the face of (his) explicit repudiation of any capacity to predict how long the process of the establishment of the kingdom would take, it seems to me quite unreasonable to suppose that Jesus believed it would necessarily be in the near future. He may have hoped this; he may have thought it probable. He must have desired it. But I do not see how he could so far have forgotten his own central position as to assert it.

And he crystallizes the two possibilities which he believed Jesus saw ahead in this way:

If then the Jewish people will accept their historic position in the Roman Empire, and in that position will act in the line of the true intention of God, intending a universal community of mankind based on love, freedom, and equality, and negating

in action the imperial claim to superiority and rulership, then of necessity the Roman will to power will destroy itself, and the community which has remained faithful to the real intention of history will fall heir to the universal society which the act of Rome has produced, and will transform it into the kingdom of heaven. The heaven will leaven the whole lump. The meek will inherit the earth.

And if the Jews refuse to accept the mission and reject it and him, what then? The intention of God will still fulfil itself. The law of self-negation will work in the Jewish nation. The Jews will be driven into rebellion against Rome and they will be destroyed. As it becomes clear that he will be rejected by his own people, this note becomes prominent in the teaching of Jesus. The most poignant expression of it is perhaps the lament over Jerusalem which ends, 'Behold, your house is left to you desolate.' But there remains the little band of disciples who have accepted him. They become the bearers of the intention to establish the kingdom. . . . They will be rejected, persecuted, hunted down, yet 'the gates of hell shall not prevail' against them.

Here is the basic truth of moral eschatology clearly and convincingly stated, with an authority all the greater perhaps because coming from a philosopher and an historian rather than from a theologian.

In view of all this, must we not say that the term 'realized eschatology', of which we have heard so much in recent years, is a most unfortunate misnomer? It is, of course, obvious that the kingdom was in a sense present wherever Jesus spoke and acted in the name and power of God—to that extent 'the kingdom has come' is a statement that may be allowed. The long-hoped-for advent of the Messiah had taken place. But the hopes and promises and expectations associated with his coming did not take place—the eschatology which included them was not realized. 'Something more than this was promised, something more has kept the advent hope living in the hearts of men.' I suggest that the time has come when we should speak rather of 'unrealized eschatology'.

When we remember the devastating wars and massacres and persecutions, the cruelty and vice and injustice which have gone on and on through the centuries, the hypocrisies and apostasies and divisions and enmities within the Christian Church, the fact that there remain vast unevangelized masses throughout the world, and now the intensification of devilish forces of destruction which threaten the very existence of human life on the earth—when we remember all these things, it surely seems a most unsatisfactory and unhelpful use of language to say, 'The Kingdom of God has come.' Apart from anything else it may well tend to weaken people's desire and hope for the future and sap their energies which should be devoted to winning it for God. Two warnings on this point may be quoted: H. V. Martin in *The Expository Times* (November 1938) wrote, 'Realized eschatology, as interpreted for instance by Dr C. H. Dodd, lacks this sense of expectation and hope for something still.' And Godfrey Phillips in the same journal (July 1943) said, 'There is an unexpected sequel (to the theory of realized eschatology) in the present-day life of the Church—namely, enfeeblement of hope regarding what is to come after the present war.'

I urge that the time has come to return to the old faith and hope enshrined in the Lord's Prayer—"Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven."

RECREATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

Harold E. Winter

EVERY NATION in the world, without exception, has its forms of relaxation and the Israelites were no different in this respect to any other nation. Somehow, because of the emphasis that is rightly put upon Israel's contribution to the religious life of the world, the idea has grown up that the Israelites spent all their time in religious pursuits, whereas a moment's thought would show how erroneous is this idea. But how did the Israelites spend their spare time? Can we obtain any idea from the Old Testament?

The Jews were an industrious people, and indeed it is still a characteristic of their nation. From the very earliest of times it had to be so. While they were a nomadic and pastoral people they could not rest at night until suitable pastures and watering had been found for the flock and material had been gathered for the fires that had to be kept in all the night long. This was essential to keep wild animals away from the sheep which represented wealth to them. Under these circumstances, therefore, there would be only little opportunity for relaxation or pleasure seeking. On most nights the shepherds would be content to drop off to sleep straightaway. It would soon be dawn and that would mean a new day for them.

As one would expect, most of the diversions of the people were in connexion with their work. The use of the bow and arrow was a stern necessity for their work as well as during war time. Like the English, who practised archery as a sport when not at war, the Israelites would undoubtedly do the same. There is a phrase in Job 16^{12, 13}, that suggests this, 'He hath also set me up for his mark. His archers compass me about' and another in Lamentations 3¹² 'He hath bent his bow, and set me as a mark for the arrow.' A parallel to this practising of archery as a sport that could also be used in work and war can be found in the use of the sling. We know that the tribe of Benjamin were considered experts in this art and with the left hand 'could sling stones at a hair breadth and not miss' (Judges 20¹⁶). David used only a sling and five smooth stones with which to vanquish the mighty Goliath (1 Samuel 17). Among those who joined themselves to David's band at Ziklag were those 'who were armed with bows, and could use both the right hand and the left in hurling stones, and shooting arrows out of a bow' (1 Chron. 12²). Such proficiency meant much practice and it seems certain that the boys would use the sling from a very early age.

It has been said that at night the people would be too tired to take part in relaxations but opportunity would present itself during the midday either before or after the midday siesta, and from our knowledge of what is still done in those countries today we may conjecture what would happen. Many stories would be told by the elders of the tribes and sometimes by wandering storytellers who visited the camps. These stories would be of the creation of the world and men by Yahweh, of the Patriarchs who had been led by Yahweh, and of the mighty warriors of the past who owed their success to the power of Yahweh.

These sagas would be committed to memory by those who heard them and handed down. Parables too formed a part of the storytelling, a good example of which is Jotham's parable of the trees told in Judges 9₇₋₁₆. The Israelites were exceedingly fond of riddles, the most famous example of which is that of Samson in Judges 14₁₄.

Out of the eater came forth meat
And out of the strong came forth sweetness

Ezekiel is bidden by God to 'put forth a riddle and speak a parable unto the house of Israel', one about two great eagles and a vine (Ezekiel 17₁₋₁₀) while the 'hard questions' with which the Queen of Sheba came to prove King Solomon were probably in this class (1 Kings 10₁).

Music, and song and dance took a large place in the peoples' enjoyment. Not only was it used in connexion with religious ceremonies in the Temple and elsewhere but also for purely personal pleasure. It is not surprising therefore that the elder brother in our Lord's parable of the Prodigal Son, as he came in from the fields, heard music and dancing. They were the natural spontaneous expression of the father's relief and joy. Jeremiah refers in 31₄ to the virgin of Israel again being 'adorned with tabrets and going forth in the dances of them that make merry'. Any special occasion brought forth music and dancing. Miriam and the other women celebrate the overthrow of the forces of Pharaoh in the Red Sea, 'with timbrels and with dance'.

Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously
The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.

(Exodus 15_{20, 21}).

The coronation of King Solomon is celebrated with the music of the trumpet and pipes (1 Kings 1₄₀). Saul and David return from the Philistinian wars to the accompaniment of music supplied by the dancing women who met them out of all the cities, singing

Saul hath slain his thousands
And David his ten thousands.

The time of the ingathering of the harvest, especially that of the vineyards, would be a time of rejoicing and it may be deduced from two passages in the book of Judges that, at such merrymaking, dancing and music formed a part. In Judges 9₂₇ the men of Shechem 'went out into the fields and gathered their vineyards, and trode the grapes' and held festival, while in Judges 21₂₁ there is recorded the story of the Benjamites, hidden in ambush at the vineyards of Shiloh, stealing the daughters of Shiloh while they were dancing in celebration of the harvest.

The gate of the city was not only the place of judgement and of business but also the place of gossip and music making especially for the young men for it is one of the lamentations contained in the book of that name that 'the elders have ceased from the gate, the young men from their music.'

It may very well be asked how the children spent their time. The parents would be more than eager to use their services in the field or in the house but with the usual adaptability of youth they would find opportunities for play. Everyone is familiar with the little parable of our Lord about the children

imitating the adult behaviour at marriage and funeral ceremonies and calling out to others who were unwilling to play, 'We piped unto you and ye did not dance; we wailed and ye did not weep'. It was probably games like these that the prophet Zechariah is thinking of when he says about a restored Jerusalem, 'the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof'. He is speaking of Jerusalem but it would be true of children all over the country.

In the apocryphal 'Gospel of Thomas' there is a grotesque story of the child Jesus, at the age of five, making twelve sparrows out of clay on the sabbath day, and, upon being remonstrated with, clapping his hands and making them fly off alive. The interest in the story lies in the light that is thrown upon the kind of things that Israelite children would do; in this case modelling in clay. That story is preceded by another that depicts our Lord playing in the ford of a mountain stream, a common pursuit, one would imagine, of the children of Nazareth. Casting our mind back to the first story mentioned, that is further proof of the interest in, and love for, animals that is characteristic of children of all nations. Probably that thought lies behind Job 41_g where the Almighty asks Job concerning leviathan (R.V. margin the crocodile), 'Wilt thou play with him as a bird, or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?'

Although life was undoubtedly hard, and at times gave cause for grave anxiety, yet nevertheless it could not be wholly dull for the Israelite. The Old Testament provides us with enough evidence to show that there were periods of relaxation and recreation, periods that would enable them to resume their work more fitted to discharge it.

WESLEY'S CONCEPT OF HIS OWN ECCLESIASTICAL POSITION

Reginald Kissack

WESLEY WAS SINGULARLY reticent about using words of accepted ecclesiological currency about himself. 'A Christian bishop', 'as much a scriptural episcopos as any man in Europe'¹ was about as far as he would go. Since at the time (1785) there were 60,000 Methodists under his care, his functions were hardly less. Yet his own word was 'Father'. E. W. Thompson called his book *Wesley, Apostolic Man*, presumably because Wesley's ordinations of 1784 were best in keeping with a man who felt he was obeying a command similar to that given to the 'apostolikos' Titus: 'Set in order the things that are wanting, and appoint elders in every city as I gave thee charge.'² But 'apostolic' implies a second-hand ministry, with powers merely delegated by an apostle, whose own authority is what comes immediately from God. Was Wesley, however, anything less than an Apostle himself, born, of course, so very much more out of due time than even St Paul?

In 1909, H. B. Workman³ used the very word of him, but in the sense of the *Didache*, as a missionary dedicated to poverty and itineracy; he put Coke and Asbury, as well as Charles Wesley, in the same category. It was, however, Wesley's own contemporaries that used the word of him in a New Testament sense. John Smith (perhaps the Archbishop of Canterbury) fastened at once on this aspect of Wesley's mission in the correspondence he had with him in 1748/9: 'If in fact you can work such signs and wonders as were wrought by the Apostles, then you are entitled to the implicit faith due to that order'.⁴ Here he probably followed the line of thought of Hooker. One 'extraordinary' way of admitting a man to spiritual functions in the Church is 'when God himself doth of himself raise up any whose labour he useth without requiring that men should authorize them; but then, he doth ratify their calling by manifold signs and tokens himself from heaven.'⁵ The same thought seems to have shaped Wesley's justification of his activities to the Bishop of Bristol in 1739. The *locus classicus* of this is the letter to Charles of 23rd June⁶: 'I have an ordinary call, and an extraordinary. . . . My extraordinary call is witnessed by works God doeth by my ministry, which prove that he is with me of a truth in this exercise of my office.' He then adds a corrective, to explain himself better: 'or, God bears witness in an extraordinary manner that my exercising thus my ordinary call is well-pleasing in his sight'. This corrective phrase indicates that thought has been given to the situation in the light of Hooker. It both defends Wesley against the particular charge that was then brought against him of 'irregularities' of ministry and indicates his own reluctance to let his mission be regarded as a new Pentecost of God. In March 1738, in a letter to Lady Cox,⁷ he had reacted very sensitively to the suggestion that the Oxford Methodists 'imagine themselves to have certain divine impulses like the divine impulses of the Apostles'. Wesley, perhaps unfortunately, liked clothing his own religious activities and experiences in the language of the Bible, and was criticized for it⁸. But he steadfastly disclaimed the motive of setting Methodism in any esoteric light: 'I claim no other direction of God's spirit than is common to all believers'.⁹

In March 1748 John Smith uses the word, to provoke from Wesley: 'I no otherwise assume the Apostolate of England (if you choose to use the phrase) than I assume the Apostolate of all Europe, or rather of all the world'.¹⁰ This did not mean that he renounced his call to 'preach up and down'.

I know God hath required this at my hand. To me His blessing is abundant proof; although such a proof as often makes me tremble. . . . I know and feel that the spring of this is a deep conviction that it is the will of God, and that were I to refrain, I should never hear the word, Well done thou good and faithful servant.¹¹

Wesley could distinguish between his normal World Parish and a special World Apostolate. In the *Farther Appeal*, Part III, he had faced the popular charge, 'Then you make yourselves like the Apostles', with:

Why, must not every man, whether clergyman or layman, be in some respects like the Apostles, or go to Hell? . . . Woe unto every Ambassador of Christ who is not like the Apostles in holiness, in making full proof of his ministry in spending and in being spent for Christ.¹²

In quite startling contrast to this denial of Apostolic destiny to the outside

world are the things he said to his own people about his own authority in Methodism. See, for instance, the *Large Minutes*.¹³ Begun in 1744, and revised from time to time, this document is a digest of the most useful matters, doctrinal and disciplinary, touched on in the various Conferences. It was given its present form in 1791, when it became the original written charter of the Practice of Methodism, as evolved under the Founder. Q. 27 asks Wesley: 'What power is this you exercise over both the Preachers and the Societies?'—a question wedged, humorously enough, between: What are the Rules of a Helper? and what reason can be assigned why so many of our Preachers contract nervous disorders? The first words of the answer, 'Count Zinzendorf', are significant too; they indicate Wesley's standard of too much power, and his continuing sense of what had disturbed him in 1738, at his first contact with the Moravians. The answer first relates Wesley's power to the historical facts of the rise of the Methodist Societies¹⁴. Wesley's powers in respect of the members of the Methodist Society, are those afforded normally by any society, and quite voluntarily, to its steward or president, 'to appoint when and where and how they should meet . . . and to remove those whose lives showed they had not a desire to flee the wrath to come'. The Society had funds, and so stewards; thus 'it was I myself, not the people, who chose the stewards'. Equally with the preachers, the same voluntary principle prevailed.

These desired me, not I them . . . to serve me as sons, and to labour when and where I should direct. . . . Power. . . . to appoint each of these when and where and how to labour . . . that is, while he chose to continue with me. For each had a power to go away as he pleased . . . And I had the power . . . to tell any (if I saw cause) 'I do not desire your help any longer.'

This power was all centralised in Wesley. In a dispute between two Preachers, Wesley interposed: 'You are called to obey me as a son in the gospel. But who can prove you are called to obey any other person?'¹⁵ Wesley invited clergy and preachers to confer with him annually.

I myself sent for these, of my own free choice. And I sent for them to advise, not govern me. Neither did I at any time divest myself of any part of the power above described, which the providence of God had cast on me, without any design, or choice of mine.

He continues:

A free Conference, that is a meeting of all the Preachers, wherein all things shall be determined by most votes . . . is possible after my death . . . but not while I live. . . . To me the Preachers have engaged themselves to submit, to serve me as sons in the gospel; but they are not thus engaged to any man, or number of men besides.

Here is a pattern of authority almost papal, not to say Zinzendorffian, but it is balanced by the principle of 'willingness'. Preacher and member alike are free to go away; no excommunication is involved. This simple, centripetal pattern issued in 1784 in the Deed of Declaration, whereby, in one straightforward act, Wesley nominated an easily identifiable conference of 100 preachers as the heir of these powers.

Holding these ideas of his powers, it was thus a bitter blow for him to find that American Methodists were not willing to accept this pattern. Ominously enough, Asbury required that the American Conference should ratify Wesley's

appointment of him as superintendent before he would accept ordination to the office. Even worse, in 1786, the American Conference refused to ratify Wesley's nomination of Whatcoat as joint-superintendent.¹⁶ Asbury explained¹⁷: 'the preachers and people were not willing to accept orders from England now that the Colonies had become independent', a commentary on how closely in those days, the boundaries of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions were assumed to coincide. Wesley accepted the position, but remarked to Whatcoat¹⁸:

It was not well-judged by Brother Asbury to *suffer*, much less indirectly to encourage, that foolish step in the late Conference. Every preacher present ought both in duty and in prudence to have said, 'Brother Asbury, Mr Wesley is *your* father, consequently ours, and we will affirm this in the face of the world'. It is truly probable that the disavowing *me* will, as soon as my head is laid, occasion a total breach between the English and American Methodists. They will naturally say, 'If they can do without us, we can do without them.'

To Asbury he wrote: 'There is a wide difference between the relation wherein you stand to the Americans, and the relation wherein I stand to all the Methodists. You are the elder brother of the American Methodists. I am under God the father of the whole family'.¹⁹ Yet there was a worse blow to fall on the old man. The Americans introduced the necessity of what they called 'universal suffrage' for office. By that the Conference vote alone put a name among the superintendents. In 1789, Wesley's own name was dropped from their *Minutes of Conference*. He wrote bitterly: 'Mr Asbury . . . sat quietly by until his friends voted my name out of the American *Minutes*. This completed the matter and showed he had no connexion with me.'²⁰ Such was the original background of the sentence used today as a slogan of the World Methodist Council: 'The Methodists are one People in all the World'.

How then are we to reconcile the voice that protests he is no Apostle, with that which claims such absolute obedience? One consideration suffices. Wesley regarded himself as the Essential Minister of Methodism, but always looked on that ministry, however irregularly, as within the setting of the Church of England. All other preachers were his Assistants, or Helpers. They were 'permitted' by him to preach; this he defined as 'directing or suffering them to do what we conceive they are moved to do by the Holy Spirit'. But he took responsibility for all who acted in his name.

¹ *The Letters of John Wesley* (Standard Edn.) VII.262, 284.

² *ibid.*, I.5.

³ *Place of Methodism in the Catholic Church*, 2nd Edn., 99ff.

⁴ *The Letters of John Wesley* (Standard Edn.) II.143.

⁵ *Ecclesiastical Polity*, VII.4.

⁶ *The Letters of John Wesley* (Standard Edn.) I.322.

⁷ *ibid.*, I.234.

⁸ *cf. ibid.*, II.206, 245.

⁹ *ibid.*, II.245.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, II.137.

¹¹ *ibid.*, II.97.

¹² *The Works of John Wesley* (3rd Edn.), VIII.220.

¹³ *ibid.*, VIII.310ff.

¹⁴ See also *The Letters of John Wesley* (Standard Edn.) II.294.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, VI.325.

¹⁶ *ibid.*, VII.339.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, VIII.90, note.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, VIII.73.

¹⁹ *ibid.*, VIII.91.

²⁰ *ibid.*, VIII.183.

THE NEW HERESY

J. E.M. Baikie

THE FACT THAT Christianity can go on producing ever-fresh heresies is surely a most encouraging sign, for a real live heresy is the mark of a living Church and a vital theology. We are moving with the times.

Now the swiftest movement of the times at present is surely that of science. Quicker and yet more quick are the steps with which it is moving forward into vaster and yet more vast realms of knowledge.

In this situation, generally speaking, theology is hard put to it to 'keep up with the Joneses'. Usually it lags behind as a poor relation, content if it can follow in the steps of its rich, scientific uncle, and gratefully acquiesce in his pronouncements with the theological version of the well-worn phrase, 'Me too!'

But the new heresy not merely quickens the steps and expands the opulence of theology so that it is abreast of all modern movements. It enables theology to go shooting past all its modern rivals into the leading place rightly belonging to it as the Queen of the Sciences.

Let me illustrate this thought with two stories, the first imaginary, the second real.

Two rockets shot into space at the same time, and, punctual to the minute, each landed on the moon's surface at the same time, with only a quarter of a mile between. On the one rocket was painted the hammer and sickle emblem, on the other the stars and stripes. The door of each rocket swung open at the same moment, and a man from each stepped out. They moved forward to meet one another, and, as they did so, recognition flashed between the two sets of eyes. Warmly they clasped hands. Said one to the other: 'Ah, Heinrich, how good it is to be able to talk German at last'. An imaginary story, but perhaps not so far removed from reality, and getting steadily nearer to it.

And the real story, announced in the Press, is this:

Father Baldwin, priest in charge of St Anne's Church, Buxton, Derbyshire, has bought an acre of land on the moon from the Inter-planetary Department Corporation of New York to enable the first church to be built there. He said: '... I found a dollar-note in my collection-box and decided to reserve a plot on the moon large enough for a church and a house for the priest. Whenever explorers have landed on virgin land, they have always immediately given praise and thanksgiving to God, and I intend this to happen if spaceships land on the moon.'

So there it is—the coming fact of inter-planetary travel, and the gold-rush, the staking of claims, already started by the Church. We are passing the Joneses right enough.

But, of course, the interest of Christianity in inter-planetary travel is not confined to the provision of churches for the human race to worship in (or not to go to) during the long lunar week-ends or the months' summer holiday on Mars. Another very vital question confronts us. If it is found that these

celestial bodies are already inhabited by living creatures, some of which approximate to what we are pleased to call *Homo sapiens* then the foreign mission societies at once become involved. It is not sufficient to carry our churches with us for our own worship in the realms and spheres of space, nor even to create, for our own convenience, planetary bishoprics in *partibus infidelium*. We must regard the new worlds opening up before our eyes as foreign mission fields for all branches of the Christian Church here on earth.

And it is at this point that the new heresy makes its appearance with the forthright declaration: 'The earth alone is the province of Christianity. All other celestial bodies are outside the scope of the Christian gospel.'

Our natural reaction is to dismiss this heresy out of hand as being patently absurd. And the sooner we do so the better, because if it gets around, and if the man in the pew hears about it, then the givings to foreign missions will sharply decline.

Much as we would like to do so, however, we cannot dispose of the new heresy by dropping it in the waste-paper basket. We must examine it in detail and prove it to be false. And indeed there are various aspects of this heresy to be considered; for untruth, as well as truth, has many facets.

The simplest, most obvious, and most naïve of these is the idea that God, who created all things visible and invisible, never meant man to conquer space, and, even if man did, God could not allow the denizens of other planets to wait through interminable centuries till the gospel should wing its way to them through space. He must have made other arrangements for the other planets.

There is a certain plausibility about such an opinion, but after all we have the same difficulty to face even in earthly matters of our faith. Why did the gospel of Christ have to wait through the centuries of this world until 'the fulness of the time had come'?

Only a few years ago a hitherto undiscovered valley with a completely unknown race of men was found in Borneo; the often-mooted 'Shangri-la' was found to be a reality at last. At once the missionary societies became interested, and sent missionaries into the area with the gospel. No one ever suggested that the remoteness of this valley meant that it should never be discovered, or that therefore the gospel did not apply here.

Many parts of the world were even more distant and inaccessible to our ancestors than the planets and satellites will shortly be to us, yet our forerunners never questioned the fact that the gospel was intended for all the world. So likewise we, in our generation, can well feel that it is equally intended for other worlds as well as for this.

The problem of the reason for delay in the coming of the gospel to these worlds is a real one, but it is one which we have had to face repeatedly here on earth. Probably we come nearest to answering it in the words of Hebrews: 'And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'

But another aspect of this heresy is more subtle. We do not know who or what awaits us on arrival at Mars. The *homo near-sapiens* of that planet may not be so very 'near', and the race of inhabitants of that or other planets may be so different from ourselves as to be unrecognizable. There may be in their minds

no sense of sin whatsoever, and consequently no feeling of need for salvation. The human race, if one may so call it, of these other planets, may be so different, and may have dimensions of character so utterly unknown to us, that to them the gospel simply cannot apply. The grace and salvation for such a race would have to be completely different from what is necessary to us.

With such a view, the poem or 'Heaven' by Rupert Brooke might well come into its own, in a way never intended by the author, as an indication of that off-centre gospel necessary to meet the situation. Brooke is putting heavenly thoughts into the minds of fish

*We darkly know, by Faith we cry,
The future is not Wholly Dry.
Mud unto Mud!—Death eddies near—
Not here the appointed End, not here!
But somewhere, beyond Space and Time,
Is wetter water, slimier slime!—
And there (they trust) there swimmeth One
Who swam ere rivers were begun
Immense, of fishy form and mind
Squamous, omnipotent, and kind;
And under that Almighty Fin
The littlest fish may enter in.*

This, of course, is only the fun of a witty writer, but there is many a truth spoken in jest. So, the advocates of the new heresy might urge, here we have a picture which is like Christianity, yet different from it, designed to suit the requirements of a different order of being from the human race. Might not such a picture be a pointer to that different kind of race and that different kind of gospel necessary for it which we might expect to find on other planets? The earth alone is the province of Christianity. The other races of the other planets will have their other gospel.

This second aspect of the new heresy is much more advanced than the first, because it posits an entirely new situation, a different order of being, and a different gospel to meet it. But I have no hesitation whatever in saying that, if this situation should be discovered, then this different gospel for this different race is heretical.

In the Christian faith, there are certain beliefs from which we can never part. One of these is that in the beginning God created all things visible and invisible; another is that

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.

It is the essence of our faith that God created all things, that Christ in the beginning with God created all things, and that this same author of creation was born here upon earth.

*Lo! within a manger lies
He who built the starry skies,
He who, throned in height sublime,
Sits amid the cherubim.*

It is of the essence of our faith that this same Christ died upon the Cross to save us from our sins, rose to life everlasting, and ascended to the glory of God the Father. What is more, this act of sacrifice on His part, though performed once at a stated time and place, was of cosmic significance, for He is 'the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world'. At the heart of the created universe there stands Christ, not only the creator, but also the sacrifice.

With such an exalted thought as that, it is obvious that the idea that the earth alone is the province of Christianity is utterly inadmissible. You cannot have in the eternal order of things two gospels—one with the Cross, and the other without the Cross; and therefore where the other planets are concerned also 'the Cross is in the field'.

There is, however, another variety of the new heresy which might seem to bring it into line with the foregoing—the idea that the other planets have Christianity already in their own forms of it.

I can best introduce this idea by referring to a story of which I heard many years ago. It was one of those imaginative tales which visualized the arrival of man on another planet, and his discovery there of a very active form of religion in which the planetarian worshippers revered as their sacred symbol, the wheel. And why? Because they believed that God had been incarnate on their planet, and that He had sacrificed His life for their salvation by being broken on the wheel. And so the wheel was to them what the Cross is to us.

Now supposing it should be found that this is no mere piece of imagination, but actual reality. Supposing our travellers from the earth discover that in the other planets the inhabitants already have a faith which is exactly the same as ours—a Son of God incarnate who suffered death for the salvation of His brethren, and rose to life everlasting—is there not here good ground for the new heresy's statement that the earth alone is the province of Christianity?

Again, even in face of this possibility, I have no hesitation in saying that the new heresy is heretical here also.

It is a cardinal belief of Christianity that once, and once only, has the Son of God from everlasting to everlasting broken into time and thereby wrought salvation for those He was not ashamed to call His brethren.

In various countries of this earth there are beliefs in other incarnations of God. But Christianity has repudiated all such, and pinned its faith to the once, and the once only, of Jesus Christ Incarnate, Crucified, Dead and Buried, Risen and Ascended.

But, it may be urged, surely such incarnations on other planets of the Son of God must be regarded as identical with ours, and, far from being heretical, they add proof to our own faith; they show the providence of God in declaring His truth in the different worlds He has made.

This last point brings us back to where we started from—the idea of remoteness, the thought of God's impatience of man finding his way from planet to planet with the glad tidings of salvation. I have already pointed out that the

same argument could be used of remote lands here on earth. And it will not hold water either for the earth or for the other planets.

All the planets of the universe operate in time. Once and once only has the eternal Son of God broken into time for the purpose of salvation. To posit many such appearances is to reduce the idea of incarnation to that of an oft-repeated sacrament.

Once and for all the writer to Hebrews has put the position plainly for us, with a far wider sweep than he ever imagined at the time of his writing:

Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world [at the consummation of the ages] he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.

In the ancient cosmology the world as we know it was always regarded as the centre of the universe, with the attendant heavenly lights of sun, moon, stars, and planets. The wonders of astronomy have altered that view considerably, showing us the littleness of the earth, and its insignificance in the universe. But now I venture to suggest that the overreachings of the new heresy have put the world back into the centre once more as the scene of God Incarnate and as the base for the evangelizing of the universe. No matter what men shall find on the other planets, all these discoveries shall yield to God in Christ. Milton's lines on the death of the gods come to us now with added force:

Nor is Osiris seen

In Memphian grove, or green, . . .

He feels from Juda's land

The dreaded infant's hand;

The rays of Bethlehem blind his dusky eye;

Nor all the gods beside

Longer dare abide, . . .

Our Babe, to show his Godhead true

Can in His swaddling bands control the damn'd crew.

With this conviction we may well feel with renewed power the words spoken three centuries ago by Johnstone of Warriston:

Wee must not now before men mince, hold up, conceal, prudentially waive anything necessary for this testimony, . . . nor quit a hoofe, or edge away an hemme of Christ's robe royal. . . . There is no authority to be ballanced with his, nor post to be set up against his post, nor the altar of Damascus against his altar.

Recent Literature

EDITED BY JOHN T. WILKINSON

The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914, by Lloyd P. Gartner. (George Allen & Unwin, 35s.)

The legend of 'the Wandering Jew' dies hard. So also does the prejudice which gave birth, not merely to the legend, but to the fact that never since the early centuries of the Christian era have Jews, living among their Christian neighbours, known what it is to have an 'abiding city'. Time and again they have experienced the tragically familiar sequence of emigration, immigration and integration into some new society. In this country the climatic period of Jewish immigration occurred between the years 1870 and 1914. The influx of new immigrants during these years was on a much larger scale than at the time of the re-establishment of a Jewish community in this country under the Protectorate, the tercentenary of which was celebrated four years ago in 1956. The story of this later period has been brilliantly told by Lloyd P. Gartner, an American Jewish sociologist, in his recently published book, *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914*. Between these two dates the number of Jews who settled here was in the neighbourhood of 120,000. The background from which they came differed in almost every conceivable way, even Jewishly, from the new situation in which they found themselves. They were a problem to themselves, to their fellow-Jews, and not surprisingly, to their non-Jewish neighbours. They came, not simply as fugitives from persecution, though the anti-Semitic pogroms of the Czarist régime in Imperial Russia were a major factor in precipitating a movement which involved, in all, upwards of a million men, women and children. An equally, if not more important factor, was the grinding pressure of the poverty in which they lived. For while the Jewish population of Russia expanded from 1,000,000 to some 6,000,000 in 1890, there was no corresponding expansion of economic opportunity. Their arrival in the East End of London, and in a number of provincial centres, gave rise to a whole host of problems. In trade, for example, 'at a time when the English worker was resembling less than ever the classical Economic Man, the "Jewish worker" was regarded as a reversion to that mythical type'—largely because under the pressure of social and economic insecurity he had become 'docile, diligent, and willing to work interminable hours'. The consequent problems for trade union organizers, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, are well described in two specially important chapters. But there are many other insights to be gained from a study of this book—insights into the social and cultural life of a community remarkable for 'its self-centredness, its utter autonomy from the rest of the population'; into the tensions created by varying degrees of religious orthodoxy—and unorthodoxy—particularly between the immigrants and members of the already well-established Anglo-Jewish community; and finally into the educational problems of a group interested primarily in the religious instruction of its children and only secondarily in their anglicization. Let no one imagine, however, that this is just a book about problems. It is first and foremost a book about people, for its author has managed in a remarkable way to 'feel' himself into the situation of those about whom he is writing. Nor is it simply a work of historic interest. It is an indispensable guide for those who, for whatever reason, are interested and perhaps themselves involved in the process of integrating the children and grandchildren of those immigrants into our contemporary society.

W. W. SIMPSON

The Piety of Jeremy Taylor, by H. Trevor Hughes. (Macmillan, 25s.)

The Principal of the new College at North Hinksey, Oxford, has written a book on the personal religion of Jeremy Taylor. Trevor Hughes deserves high praise for what he has written and still higher praise for what he has left out. As a result, he has given us an admirable guide-book to piety in the seventeenth century. It must have been a task beset with difficulties. There are four main parts of the book; The Biographical Sketch (pp.1-16); Theological Position (pp.17-44); General Principles of Taylor's Piety (pp. 45-93); Taylor's Piety in Practice (pp. 93-152); and there is a Conclusion (pp.153-77). The following sentences will show both how generously Jeremy Taylor can deal with his opponents and how Mr. Hughes can select a paragraph which gives us Jeremy Taylor at his best. Taylor had to govern a diocese which contained uncompromising protagonists of the Presbyterian form of government, to which Taylor was opposed both by tradition and conviction. Secondly, in spite of the difficulties, we find echoes in the Irish period of the note sounded in *The Liberty of Prophesying*. If Taylor had written nothing else he would have put us in his debt, for this book is an impassioned plea for tolerance, that those who are united in their love for Christ should be united in their love for one another. Taylor's enthusiasm for holiness gave him a vision beyond that of ecclesiastical order.

R. NEWTON FLEW

La confirmation au cours des siècles, by Lukas Vischer. (Delachaux & Niestlé, fr. 5.50.)

La sagesse de Dieu, Explication de 1 Corinthiens, by Gaston Deluz. (Delachaux & Niestlé.)

The wily examinee is advised to avoid the kind of question that ends peremptorily: Discuss. The aim of these Cahiers théologiques is to promote informed discussion, and Dr. Vischer makes a helpful contribution to the debate. What Kierkegaard called 'la comédie chrétienne de la confirmation' is often a passing-out rather than a passing-in parade. Dr. Vischer writes for German-speaking Protestants, and his work is here translated for those who read French, but a British Methodist finds himself wondering about 'The Public Reception of New Members' [sic], and its relation to the baptism into the Trinitarian Name of an infant, and to the invitation so often heard and given (but unmentioned in the new Manual of Membership) that all who desire to love the Lord Jesus Christ are welcome at His Table. The British Methodist goes on to wonder what is the relation between the modern Sunday school and the traditional catechetical method of the Church. All this means that Dr Vischer succeeds. He scans two thousand years in under 100 pages, and if the unintentional impression is given that life begins at 1520, this serves to state the modern dilemma. He examines the thinking about baptism and confirmation, infant baptism and catechetical instruction in the Early, Mediaeval and Reformed Churches, and draws upon the writings of the nineteenth century to bring us to the present. Lack of space forbids him to do more than brandish his sword against Rome, and that when dealing with Hippolytus. As often happens, two most fruitful references are in the footnotes where Taizé and Iona are mentioned. Max Thurian of Taizé desires to separate admission to Holy Communion from Confirmation. Confirmation should be seen as an act of consecration for laymen, and interpreted in terms of the mission of the whole Church in the world, rather than the admission of the individual from the world to the Church. At Iona, there is an office called 'an occasion to make an act of committal or renew his discipleship'. (A Methodist perhaps ought to explore the corporate dimension of the Covenant Service.) But these references suggest that the resolution of the dilemma will be found only in the living Missionary Church in the

ecumenical age, that is, when the Church seeks Christ first, desires to be led to do what the Spirit pleases, and then, through the same Spirit, thinks about what has happened. For when it is recognized that the Spirit is His own authority, Confirmation will cease to be the time when Swiss boys begin to wear long trousers, take up smoking, and, like Daddy, stop going to church. Then perhaps the laying-on of hands can be seen, not as the giving of the Holy-Spirit—whoever gave God away?—but, that activity of His people, like preaching and praying, like sacrificial living and giving, which His Sovereign Spirit condescends to bless.

Dr Deluz adds to an attractive series of commentaries what is called an 'explication'. In the Preface he encourages people to read the Bible in conjunction with a commentary. This, he says, is much more profitable than fortuitous selection of passages for study and meditation. We agree. But 'explication' is not commentary, and though we can find our way through 1 Corinthians better as a result of this book, we are not driven to the text of Scripture as we ought to be. This disappointment is caused only by the excellence of the other volumes in the series. The material in this book reaches the same high standard, though differently presented from the rest, and it fulfils the same kind of function as the Daily Study Bible.

C. HUGHES SMITH

The Origins of Love and Hate, by Ian D. Suttie. *The Psychology of Thinking*, by Robert Thomson. (Pelican Books 3s. 6d.)

Both these small books are to be recommended, not because we agree with everything they contain, but because of their significance for religious thinking. Dr Suttie's book was first published in 1935 and was one of the earliest criticisms of Freud, though he, doubtless, would not have called it that. Its reprint in this popular form shows that what he had to say still has weight. His view of the part to be played by Christianity misunderstands, as one might expect, its doctrinal and dogmatic significance. His psychological interpretations of Peter and Paul, the rather doubtful slant given to certain events in Church history, and throughout the misunderstanding of what the Christian theologian has to say about sin and guilt, are points that will arouse discussion in the mind of an informed reader. But, nevertheless, he is sympathetic to the place and meaning of religion in modern society, and refuses to follow Freud in dismissing it as illusion. His penetrating tracking down of the defects in psychoanalytic theory to Freud's own personal upbringing, shed light, not only on its origins, but also on many of its peculiar features today. The book is inevitably dated, as the section on memory shows. It is doubtful if what he said there could be now sustained in the light of modern research. But it is good to have this still valuable and creative book in a cheap edition. Dr Suttie's early death was a loss to us all. Penguin Books, Ltd., are to be congratulated in publishing his work in a series whose price is within the reach of all.

Mr Thomson's is a new work which sets out to answer the question: How do we think? It is written in much professional jargon, and with an eye always lifting towards mathematical processes. It gives, nevertheless, a succinct account of recent research, and has, again, many suggestions for the Christian. What he has to say, for instance, about the conditions necessary for creative thinking are worth pondering by the Churches facing such a disturbed and swiftly-changing world. Further, Mr Thomson is at least sympathetic to a non-mechanistic interpretation of human thinking and behaviour. Both these books show how, in the last thirty years, psychology has moved away from the purely determinist theories of the early pioneers, and has become more susceptible to spiritual interpretations of life and destiny.

JOHN CROWLESMITH

The Art of Spiritual Healing, by Joel S. Goldsmith. (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.).

What has come to be known as 'spiritual healing' is much to the fore these days in Christian circles. It is a field of inquiry needing investigation which should be set in the context of both medicine and psychology. It must be rescued from superstition on the one hand and quackery on the other. This book, which has an American provenance, does neither. Indeed, medicine is ignored, the underlying supposition being that 'spiritual healing' replaces it, while the researches of psychology on the unconscious might never have taken place. What theology there is is pantheistic. God is more often referred to as 'IT'. One of the author's phrases is 'God is expressing Himself now'. He believes it is a failure in spiritual experience to pray for things, despite our Lord's teaching in the Gospels. The secret of healing is defined as 'God appearing in you.' It is based on the belief that sin, disease and death have 'no externalized reality'. They exist only as illusory concepts. In the face of realized spiritual truth they fade away. Here we are conscious of the shade of Mrs Eddy presiding over the scene. Yet at other times the author seems to accept the reality of matter and involves himself in contradictions which persist to the end of the book. Emphasis is put on the fact that the spiritual healer has to forget 'people as people'. He is advised never to come down to the level of 'trying to pick up individual problems'. A person in the healing ministry must as far as possible separate himself from human contacts'. One cannot help asking if Jesus did this when He sat down with publicans and sinners. There are good things to be noted, especially the insistence that the end of healing is spiritual regeneration. He has some helpful words about death and an excellent chapter on giving. But, regarded as a whole, this is not a book for those who want a truly Christian approach to the subject. It is full of a theology that the Church can only regard as dubious, and in its implication that all who are in conscious communion with God can heal, full of danger. JOHN CROWLESMITH

Selections from the Sacred Writings of the Sikhs. (Allen & Unwin, 22s.)

The religious teachings of the Sikhs are not very well known in the West, though turbaned and bearded Sikhs are common enough here as travelling salesmen. Few English readers will have heard the scriptures chanted in the Golden Temples of Amritsar or elsewhere. So this selection is especially welcome, made by five Sikh scholars, and published as part of U.N.E.S.C.O.'s project for appreciation of cultural values of East and West. The Sikh religion was a latecomer among the world's faiths and, as one might expect in India, was a confessed syncretism, an effort to combine the monotheism of Islam with the fervour of Hinduism. Yet it hardly spread beyond the Punjab, where the founder, Nanak, lived from 1469 to 1539. His 'disciples' (Sikhs) included men of both faiths, and the *Adi Granth*, the Sikh scriptures, is distinctive in containing hymns by Hindus and Muslims as well as Sikhs. From Islam the religion took belief in one God, known as the Name (*Nam*), and opposition to idolatry, but it retained Hindu ideas of karma and rebirth. The *Adi Granth*, 'primal book', or *Guru Granth Sahib*, is the greatest work of Punjabi literature. It is a collection of hymns, set to music and chanted in temples and by Sikhs privately, and largely the work of the fifth of the ten Sikh Gurus (teachers), Guru Arjun. There are 947 hymns by the founder, Nanak, of which fifty-five appear in this selection. The most famous is the Japji, the Sikh morning prayer: 'There is one God, Eternal Truth is his Name . . . by the grace of the Guru, made known to men.' The other Gurus contributed their quota, especially Guru Arjun, who composed over 2,000 hymns; some of these bring a female mystical element into this rather masculine faith: 'The Spouse of the Lord is happy . . . she remaineth absorbed in the Lord's love'. Of the non-Sikh authors the best known is Kabir, the Muslim

weaver of Benares who became disciple of the Hindu Ramanand and proclaimed that God is both Allah and Ram, in temple and in mosque. Well translated and introduced, this selection, while not complete, is valuable in making easily available a treasury of Indian devotion. No student of mysticism should miss it.

GEOFFREY PARRINDER

Wesley's Christology, An Interpretation by John Deschner. (S.M.U. Press, Dallas, \$4.50. 30s.)

I found this book hard to read, not only because the style is stiff and unadorned, but because it is so obviously a thesis prepared with unremitting labour and most adequate scholarship, but never coming to life as one might hope from an examination of Wesley's theological thinking. One reason is that, despite Dr Deschner's setting of Wesley's Christological views under the comprehensive headings of the Person, Status and Work of Christ and then His authority as Prophet, King and Priest, Wesley does not really take kindly to this treatment. His most ardent admirer would never claim that he said anything strongly original in Christology. His real contribution lay in working out the idea of God's love being as great as His power in salvation, assurance, holiness and fellowship. A secondary consequence in this approach was the fresh attention he drew to the work of the Holy Spirit. This doctoral dissertation, therefore, will serve the student best as a compendium of all that Wesley thought about the person and work of Christ. Here one can discover with abundant references the Wesley stress on our Lord's divinity, with perhaps an under-emphasis on His humanity. On the 'Status of Christ' the author wisely realizes that Wesley had little to say and that in considering our Lord's work Wesley constantly referred to His prophetic, priestly, and kingly office. It is a thousand pities in this regard that he did not use Charles's hymns to show that in this respect the brothers were so entirely at one. There are some indications that the author realizes how all Wesley's Christology is related directly to the work of Christ in salvation but despite the words on the jacket this is not sufficiently developed. Quite rightly, the author leans heavily on the *Sermons* and the *Notes on the New Testament*, but he scarcely seems to realize how much treasure he might have found in the hymns, especially his translations from the German, in the *Letters*, and in diverse references scattered throughout the *Works* in various pamphlets. This is much to be regretted. The book by the fullness of its treatment will become definitive for this aspect of Wesley's theological thought, and it is one more pleasing indication that reputable scholars on the Continent, Great Britain, and America, have turned in recent years to a fresh realization of the worth and standing of John Wesley as a theologian with an original cast of mind.

MALDWIN EDWARDS

The Heeded Voice, by E. D. Mackerness. (Heffer, 21s.)

The somewhat ambiguous title is explained in the sub-title: the book is formed of 'studies in the literary status of the Anglican Sermon, 1830-1900'. So stated the book might well seem to be a thesis of limited interest only. In plain fact the style is clear if not distinguished, and the contents are of interest to all preachers with an interest in their craft. The author has chosen six great preachers as pegs on which to hang his observations of differing phases of preaching in the Victorian age. Some might be disposed to quarrel with particular names, though for my part I would only have asked that it might be extended to include at least one representative of the Scott-Holland, Canon Barnett, Charles Gore school of High Church socialism so prominent in the last quarter of the century. The book would further have been improved by a preliminary sketch of the various parties and shades of thought in the Church of England as the century proceeded. If the book is to be read by Free Churchmen, an indication of when Tractarianism arose and what it stressed would be

valuable before the consideration of John Henry Newman and Henry Parry Liddon, 'The Diadochus of the Tractarians'. Certainly Charles Kingsley ought to be set against the Christian Socialism of his period and Benjamin Jowett needs to be understood in the light of the Broad Church party so strong in the second half of the century, with their objection to dogmatics and their desire to interpret the formularies and rubrics in a distinctly liberal sense. The short biographical sketches at the end of the book do not atone for the lack of a description of those parties within the Church of England, of whom the six chosen preachers are at least partly representative. The author's predilections sometimes affect his judgement, and one noticeable example is his quotation with approval of Dean Stanley's perverse description of Kingsley as a 'layman in the guise or disguise of a clergyman'. To call this the 'kindest estimate of Kingsley a contemporary Christian gentleman could offer' is not a reflection on Kingsley, but on the author of this book. His concluding chapter on the last three decades of the century takes no account of those vast social, economic, and scientific changes which were so profoundly altering England and shaping its forms that the chance the author gave himself with the chapter heading he failed to take. All in all the book is readable and at times perceptive but deeper levels are never plumbed.

MALDWIN EDWARDS

A Light to the Nations, by N. K. Gotanormalwtd. (Harper, \$6.50.)

In this lavishly produced volume, the Professor of Old Testament studies at the Andover Newton Theological School, Massachusetts, offers 'a synthesis of the interests and values' of Old Testament introduction, history and theology. The sub-title of the book, 'An Introduction to the Old Testament', fulfils the reader's expectations in so far as an informed and critical account is given of all the literary units. These are, however, set in their historical framework, while particular attention is drawn to the religious message of each writing in relation to the faith of Israel as a whole. The work is abundantly and effectively illustrated with photographic plates, maps and charts, and includes a selection of translations of some of the more important extra-biblical near-eastern texts. Also included are a glossary of names and technical terms, extensive bibliographies and copious indexes. For the most part, Professor Gottwald supports the majority view of Old Testament scholars on critical questions, and the main value of his book lies not in its presentation of any new thesis, but in its commendable attempt to present a holistic view of the Old Testament. The author's immense diligence and sound scholarship are clearly manifest, and he writes his long story with clarity and enthusiasm. Despite its length, the book inevitably suffers from the limitations of any work which seeks to survey the main conclusions of the immense literature of Old Testament scholarship. The serious student will not find in it an adequate substitute for the standard works on any of the many topics with which it deals. To read it, however, towards the end of his course, could be of great help in weaving together the diverse strands of his studies into a meaningful whole. Similarly, the minister or layman desiring to revive and bring up to date his earlier Old Testament studies, would find here a valuable and rewarding refresher course, as well as a reliable and comprehensive work of reference.

S. C. WHETTON

La Foi et les Œuvres, Commentaire de l'Épître de Jacques, by Ed. Thurneysen. (Delachaux et Niestlé.)

The Epistle of James is not a favourite. Writers as conscientious and different as Pascal and Tennyson have not avoided attributing St James' words to others. Some students know of it only because of the first verse of the second chapter, and they debate the meaning of *τῆς δόξης*. This may be because Luther called it 'strawy', because King James' version seems exceedingly terse, or because we need a new

commentary. Between 18th August 1940 and 20th July 1941, Dr Thurneysen preached to a church in Basel expository sermons on the whole epistle. We now have an adaptation into French of those nineteen sermons. A good sermon preached does not necessarily make a good sermon written, nor a series of sermons preached a published commentary—at least in this century. The preacher is a herald by whose testimony his hearers are confronted with the risen Christ. Is the commentator's task not rather to illuminate the hidden factors of a book's provenance, so that the book itself speaks clearly to us? But perhaps this epistle of James can only be interpreted through a living encounter of persons. More than one heart sank at one Swanwick Conference, when the Bible Group Leader announced his intention of leading the Conference in a study of James, but in the personalizing of the written word by the fellowship of a group, the epistle became the Word of God, addressed to that group. If this is a book of sermons, the old question of whether we proclaim 'Gabe' or 'Aufgabe' is raised, for there is a great deal of exhortation. The hidden factor to help our understanding the epistle is the Theology of the Word of God. When therefore St James quite ordinarily uses the word *religion*, Dr Thurneysen has to use inverted commas. Religion has become 'religion'. Further difficulties occur when exhortation to personal serenity (1₁₀₋₂₁), which seems quite straightforward in the light of Jesus' saying about that which proceeds out of the mouth, is taken to apply to the Service of the Word. The dilemma becomes acute in the comment on 2₁₄₋₂₆—'faith without works is dead'. One paragraph asserts that the works referred to are the Works of God, the Cross and Resurrection of Christ. If a massive structure of theology is to be brought into play, then the Work of the Holy Spirit must be mentioned. This never happens. Christ is our brother by His Coming and His Death; we never sense the release of knowing that we are in Him and He in us, that our being caught up in God's work is itself God's work. The commentary on healing (5₁₄₋₁₅) is extremely good, though it may be noted that there is an omission in the scriptural text at the head of the chapter. The exposition of prayer (5_{16, 17}) is likewise satisfying. The treatment of the last two verses of the epistle, where Thurneysen takes *αὐτοῦ* with *ψυχὴν* seems to fulfil more nearly the linguistic requirements of commentary. We are told what the epistle means; we are not enabled to find the meaning for ourselves. This makes an unwelcome distinction between the pulpit and the study. The question remains: who is St James?

C. HUGHES SMITH

Philosophic Papers, by G. E. Moore. (George Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

Few would deny that G. E. Moore, who was taken from us last year, was one of the great influences in Philosophy at Cambridge, and far outside, in the last half-century. He first became known by his *Principia Ethica*, published in 1903, followed by his *Ethics*, 1912: then by his *Philosophical Studies*, 1922, and much later by his *More Problems of Philosophy*, 1953. Without the more varied interests of C. D. Broad, and wholly out of sympathy with the Hegelianism that flourished in Oxford for the last decades of the previous century, or with the Logical Positivism which took its place, he was regarded as embodying all that was best in Cambridge philosophy till his death. The book before us, introduced by a biographical notice by C. D. Broad, contained eleven essays, all but three of them previously published in various periodicals but not now easily obtainable. Each one needs to be read with care; but, as one may say without disrespect to the author, each will leave a sense of disappointment behind it. Conscious that he works as an analyst and a critic, Moore brings each subject on his stage clothed in simple and even homespun language; so intent on not commercing with the skies that the reader must put up, as Moore would wish, with the jog-trot. For instance, he asks in the first paper whether the characteristics of particular things are universal or particular—an old question. If A and B are red, is the redness of A

one thing and of B another? The meaning of character is never considered, nor the possibility that the associations in the mind of the percipient may be of any importance. The question is thus left open. In the 'Defence of Common Sense' much is said of the reality of space and of time, but no clear discussion of reality; much on mental facts or even 'facts of class', and to dreams, as elsewhere, but nothing on the various meanings, familiar to a student of Greek, of 'common sense' itself. 'Facts and Propositions' turns on a discussion with Mr F. P. Ramsey, mainly on 'my' judgement that Julius Caesar was murdered, and ending up with a catalogue of propositions which are compatible or incompatible with that statement of murder, leading on to the formula, 'for all x , fx '. A brief symposium, 'Is Goodness a Quality?', with H. W. B. Joseph and A. E. Taylor, will recall to many the central contention of Moore's book on ethics, that goodness cannot be defined—absolute goodness is here considered as an experience, when taken apart from all qualifying expressions, intrinsically worth having, from which, rightly understood, it may be learned that a good poem and goodness are the same thing. It is a pity that save, in the title of the paper, Taylor's remains entirely unmentioned; both authors seem to have left value in treatment of intrinsic and worth.

The discussion of imaginary objects, where Mr Gilbert Ryle is the opponent, turns entirely on the proposition that Mrs Bardell fainted in Pickwick's arms. What does it tell us, or refuse to tell us about 'a man called Pickwick'? And what more does it tell us than by simply stating 'A fainted in the arms of B?' The next Essay, on 'Is Existence a Predicate?', is a discussion, with Mr Kneale, on what is implied by 'some tame tigers growl'? Even at the end of the twelve pages we are still in some doubt whether they actually do. Is saying 'a tiger is tame and growls', like saying 'Socrates is a man and a Greek'? There the reader cannot but regret that Moore should not have referred to the ingenuity of the Greek Language, where 'te . . . te' suggests the simple copula 'and', while 'men' and 'de' suggests 'and yet' or 'but even'. This discussion, like so many others left with a *non liquet*, leads on to Kant's 'scandal', that the existence of things outside us must be accepted merely in faith. Pain, after-images, and even a soap-bubble, will diminish, Moore thinks, the scandal, as the sight of a cat between twelve noon and five minutes after twelve. But are we to conclude that to Moore Kant's own work on the subject is to count for nothing? The next three essays, it must be confessed (one of them on Russell's Theory of Description) take us but little further. But it will doubtless be reassuring to know that there are at least six sentences which may be entailed by stating that the Author of *Waverley* was Scotch; and that Moore felt that there is a difference between being certain and being absolutely certain; though he is not quite sure what is the difference between saying 'it is certain' and 'I am certain'. The last and far the longest essay deals with Wittgenstein in Cambridge in 1930 to 1933, and contains the notes which Moore took of lectures delivered to audiences there. But Moore was often puzzled, as sometimes was the lecturer himself, over his meaning, and the subject often jumps from one topic to another. The place of Wittgenstein's philosophy has yet to be decided. It would ill become a mere 'indolent reviewer' to use of Moore what Moore himself used of Russell and others on occasion; but whatever may be the value of the study of Semantics—'What did he mean?' 'What should he have meant?' 'what should we mean?'—we shall still be drawn to the question of jesting Pilate; Moore undeed in his solemn way insists in those pages that he can find no 'good reason to suppose that there is a God at all', or 'that we as human beings shall continue to exist and to be conscious after the death of our bodies'. Can a husband be as sure of his wife's fidelity to him as that at a given moment he holds his hands in front of his face? The philosophy that refuses to treat such a question as relevant will have but a dusty answer to give to the demands of life.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

Visible and Invisible, by Giovanni Miegge; translated Stephen Neill. (Mowbrays, 15s.).

Methodists should have a particular interest in this book, since its author is one of the three tutors of the Facolta' Valdese, at Rome, where Methodist as well as Waldensian ministerial students are trained. In translating with customary feeling Miegge's *Per Una Fede*, Stephen Neill has given the English-speaking world a rare, if not unique, glimpse of the quality and orbit of modern Italian Protestant theology. Miegge's ministry, which began in 1924, is roughly coeval with the Fascist régime, and these 'Christian Affirmations in a Secular Age' are the fruit of a bitter prophetic wrestling not only with these flesh and blood powers (as if that were not enough), but with the fears within of a warfare against Tuberculosis, which at one stage robbed him (thanks be, but for a while) of his Chair at the Seminary. Thus Miegge's faith rises *de profundis*. Its insights equally came from the Alpine heights, out of the secret meetings of a group of friends, those 'giornate teologiche di Chiavas' that precious spiritual refuge of the Waldensians in Fascist times, or out of the solitariness of convalescence looking unto the hills. Its basis is the trodden remains of that Continental Liberalism and that Social Christianity, whose discomfiture also gave us Barth and Tillich. Miegge went back to Luther, in search of that faith by which a just man alone can live. He has become one of Barth's keenest appraisers, with an eye that finds significance in his more liberal side. *Visible and Invisible* has twelve chapters; The Problem of God, The Word and the Spirit, The Analogy of Faith, Jesus the Man, The Word, The Cross, The Lord, The Meaning of History, The Creation, The Messenger and the Message, The Fulfilment, and Immortality and Resurrection. The book was projected as a statement of Protestant principles, as a manifesto of Italian Protestantism facing the post-war era of hope and freedom; Miegge however has made it an even greater book by giving it a more personal tone. For that reason, it has a power to help others also that are tempted to lose faith in the twentieth century. It is just the book to put before our best young minds who are hungry for a faith, yet afraid that they know all the answers to their wistfulness. Particularly apposite is his light sketching in of the historical dimensions of modern ideas; we are so often ignorant of the dubious origins of so many of the ruling concepts that sway our minds so absolutely. And for those concerned with the theological gulf between Britain and the Continent, it is almost uncanny (as Neill notes in the Introduction) to see how close are Miegge's ultimate ideas to our own, a proof surely that one and the same Spirit leads in all his Church.

R. KISSACK

Our Contributors

J. E. M. BAIKIE
B.D., M.LITT.

MICHAEL BANTON
B.SC.(ECON.), PH.D.

DONALD J. BOYS
B.D., PH.D.

RODERIC DUNKERLEY
B.A., B.D., PH.D.

REGINALD KISSACK
M.A., B.D.

G. ERNEST LONG
M.A.

DONALD G. MACRAE
M.A.

HARRY PARKIN
B.D., M.TH.

SHEILA PATTERSON
M.A.

W. S. PENN
B.SC.

D. F. ROBERTS
M.A., D.PHIL.

WILLIAM D. ROBINSON
M.TH.

FREDERIC VANSON

JOHN T. WILKINSON
M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.

HAROLD E. WINTER
B.D.

Minister of the Church of Scotland. Contributor to various journals.

Lecturer in Social Anthropology, Social Sciences Research Centre, University of Edinburgh. Author of *The Coloured Quarter: negro immigrants in a dockland area* (Cape, 1955); *West African City: a study of tribal life in Freetown* (O.U.P.) 1957; *White and Coloured: British Behaviour towards coloured immigrants* (Cape, 1959). Editor of *Darwinism and the Study of Society* (Tavistock, 1961).

Methodist Minister.

Congregational Minister for many years. Author of *The Hope of Jesus and Beyond the Gospels*.

Methodist Minister; Missionary Committee Representative the Italy District. Author of *A Clue to Rome: Introduction to a City*.

Methodist Minister; Lecturer in Pastoral Theology, Church History and Organization at Handsworth College.

Educated in Glasgow and Balliol College, Oxford. First University Lecturer in Sociology, Oxford. Reader in Sociology, University of London (L.S.E.). Visiting Professor University College, Ghana and University of California (Berkeley). Managing Editor, *The British Journal of Sociology*. Editor, *Heinemann Books on Sociology*.

Methodist Minister, Manningtree and Harwich Circuit. Trained at Hartley Victoria College, Manchester, 1949-52. Missionary in the Mysore Diocese of the Church of South India, 1952-6.

Social anthropologist working with the Institute of Race Relations, London. Educated at Roedean, Oxford, and the London School of Economics, and has made studies of racial or immigrant situations in South Africa, Canada and Britain. Publications include—*Colour and Culture in South Africa*, *The Last Trek*, and a forthcoming book on West Indian migrants in Brixton.

A chemist turned historian and archaeologist. Director of Excavations at the Roman Settlement at Springhead, Kent, and an authority on Roman temples. Publications include papers in *Archaeologia Cantiana*, *Journal of Roman Studies*, *The Countryman*, etc.

University Demonstrator in Physical Anthropology at Oxford. His general interest lies in biological variation in man, and particularly in the processes of racial differentiation. Field studies have taken him amongst more remote peoples of central Africa, the subjects of many of his writings.

Methodist Minister. Educated Palmers College, Grays and Richmond College. Now Minister in Wakefield Circuit.

Teacher by profession, poet and historical journalist in the intervals. Has lectured on literature and history in Derbyshire where he lived for twelve years. Contributor to British and American periodicals and the B.B.C. Other interests: mysticism, philosophy and music.

Ranmoor Tutor in Church History and English (1946-59) and Principal (1953-9) of Hartley Victoria College, Manchester. Author of *Richard Baxter and Margaret Charlton: A Puritan Love-Story*, *Hugh Bourne* (1772-1852); *William Clowes* (1780-1851); and *Principles of Biblical Interpretation* (A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture, 1960). Editor of *Baxter's The Reformed Pastor* and *Arthur Samuel Peake* (1865-1929): *Essays in Commemoration and Selections from His Writings*.

Methodist Minister.

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

ORIGEN AND DOCTRINE OF GRACE

By Benjamin Drewery

The N.T. doctrine of Grace is taken as the touchstone of Christian orthodoxy, and an endeavour is made for the first time to trace the doctrine of Grace implicit in the vast corpus of Origen's writings. The inquiry leads into such fascinating themes as Creation, Providence and the problem of evil; the Incarnation, Passion and Continuing Work of Christ; the Grace of the Holy Spirit; the place and inspiration of Holy Scripture.

30s. net

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN

By C. A. Coulson, F.R.S.

The Beckly Lecture, 1960

In this lecture Prof. Coulson describes some of the more fascinating aspects of the new age that is being born as a result of scientific and technological discovery, and discusses the problems that it raises for Christian thought. The new developments of the atomic age widen the field of human choice, and therefore make possible a fuller life for all people everywhere.

8s. 6d. net

PRINCIPLES OF BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION

The Peake Memorial Lecture, 1960

By F. T. Wilkinson

There is not a little evidence that many people are returning to a reading of the Bible. Many find difficulty, however, in understanding it, and misunderstanding is not uncommon. This short book has therefore been written to indicate the right approach to it.

6s. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

THE CHOIR

Edited by DR J. ALAN KAY, M.A.

Associate Editor: DR F. B. WESTBROOK

There is some good stuff in this magazine, of interest to organist, chorister and ordinary worshipper alike. Dr Kay and Dr Westbrook marshall a team of interesting and often provocative writers.

1s. 3d. monthly

Annual Subscription 17s. post free

We shall be pleased to send a specimen copy

THE EPWORTH PRESS, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

METHODISM MOCKED

By Albert M. Lyles

This is an examination of the hostile literary reaction expressed in satire to Methodism and the Methodist leaders, John Wesley and George Whitfield, in the eighteenth century. It considers the basis for satiric attacks on such Methodist practices as field preaching and hymn singing, and on the theological doctrine emphasized by the Methodists, particularly justification by faith and perfection.

25s. net

THE PRIESTHOOD OF ALL BELIEVERS

By C. Cyril Eastwood

This book is an attempt to present a clear and constructive statement of a doctrine which lies at the very heart of Protestantism, and which is closely connected with three important issues in current theological discussion—the union of the Churches, the doctrine of vocation, and the liturgical revival.

30s. net

A SHROPSHIRE SAINT

A Study of Fletcher of Madeley

By George Lawton

This study commemorates the two hundredth anniversary of John Fletcher's institution to the living of Madeley in Shropshire, the parish which he turned into the Mecca of Methodism during an incumbency of twenty-five years. Close examination of Fletcher's voluminous writings reveals him as a far greater and more fascinating man, priest, writer, theologian, and saint, even than his admirers asserted.

15s. net

TREASURES OF DARKNESS

By David N. Francis, M.A.

Is the Christian Gospel *always* 'good news'? Can our faith bring joy in *every* time of trouble? Those are the questions which this book faces. It is the conviction of the writer that God is able to turn and transform every calamity so that blessings may flow from it, and to offer us something positive and redemptive through even the darkest experiences of life.

5s. net

PRAYERS OF THE REFORMERS

Compiled by Clyde Manschreck

Here at prayer are the great Reformers of the sixteenth century. Here are Calvin, Cranmer, Luther, Knox, Tyndale, to name a few. These are the prayers of men who believed themselves to be the instruments of God's will in the purification of the Christian Church. In this book the leader of public worship will find inspiration and guidance from the example of the great Reformers.

10s. 6d. net

THE CHRISTIAN MORALITY

By T. E. Jessop, O.B.E., M.C., M.A.

This book consists of six open lectures given at Cambridge under the aegis of the Faculty of Divinity. The moral teaching of Jesus is expounded as a rebuke to the Pharisees for letting their religious duties kill their moral responsibility, and that of Paul as addressed chiefly to the Gentiles and enriched by Christological reference.

10s. 6d. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1
